THEOLOGICAL DICTIONARY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

Edited by

G. Johannes Botterweck
Helmer Ringgren
Heinz-Josef Fabry

VOLUME XIII

THEOLOGICAL DICTIONARY

OF THE

OLD TESTAMENT

EDITED BY

G. JOHANNES BOTTERWECK,

HELMER RINGGREN,

AND

HEINZ-JOSEF FABRY

Translated by

DAVID E. GREEN

Volume XIII

קוץ – רָקִיעַ

qôṣ — rāqîaʿ

WILLIAM B. EERDMANS PUBLISHING COMPANY
GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN / CAMBRIDGE, U.K.

CONSULTING EDITORS

George W. Anderson
Henri Cazelles
David Noel Freedman
Shemaryahu Talmon
Gerhard Wallis

CONTRIBUTORS

W. B. Barrick, Billings
H. M. Barstad, Hokksund
R. Bartelmus, Kiel
W. A. M. Beuken, Louvain
K.-M. Beyse, Halle am Saale
E. Blum, Heidelberg
M. L. Brown, Pensacola
R. E. Clements, Cambridge
J. Conrad, Jena
U. Dahmen, Bonn
C. Dohmen, Regensburg
H.-J. Fabry, Bonn (Editor)
E. Firmage, Jr., Salt Lake City
I. Fischer, Bonn
G. Fleischer, Bonn
C. Frevel, Cologne
H. F. Fuhs, Paderborn
R. E. Gane, Berrien Springs
M. Görg, Munich
J. Hausmann, Budapest
F. L. Hossfeld, Bonn
M. Kartveit, Stavanger
B. Kedar-Kopfstein, Haifa
†D. Kellermann, Tübingen
E.-M. Kindl, Bonn
†T. Kronholm, Madla
H. Lamberty-Zielinski, Alfter
E. Lipiński, Louvain
R. Liwak, Berlin
†P. Maiberger, Mainz
J. Marböck, Graz
J. Milgrom, Jerusalem
P. Mommer, Bochum
R. Mosis, Mainz
H.-P. Müller, Münster
†M. J. Mulder, Badhoevedorp
K. Nielsen, Arhus
M. Oeming, Heidelberg
†H.-D. Preuss, Neuendettelsau
S. Rattray, Berkeley
F. V. Reiterer, Salzburg
E. Reuter, Wallenhorst
D. Rick, Bonn
H. Ringgren, Uppsala (Editor)
U. Rüterswörden, Bonn
L. Ruppert, Fulda
M. Sæbø, Sandviken
†J. Scharbert, Munich
G. Schauerte (Barteldrees), Bonn
H. Schmoldt, Norderstedt
K.-D. Schunck, Rostock
T. Seidl, Würzburg
H. Simian-Yofre, Rome
F. J. Stendebach, Mainz
S. Talmon, Jerusalem
S. Tengström, Uppsala
W. Thiel, Bochum
J. Tropper, Berlin
G. Vanoni, Mödling
L. Wächter, Berlin
G. Wallis, Halle am Saale
E.-J. Waschke, Haale am Saale
M. Zipor, Ramat-Gan
†H.-J. Zobel, Greifswald

CONTENTS

Abbreviations

AAAS	*Annales archéologiques Arabes Syriennes,* Damascus
AANLR	*Atti dell'Academia Nazionale dei Lincei, Rendiconti,* Rome
AASF	*Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae*
ÄAT	*Ägypten und Altes Testament: Studien zur Geschichte, Kultur und Religion Ägyptens und des AT*
AAWL(M)	*Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literature,* Mainz
AB	*Anchor Bible,* ed. W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman, Garden City, N.Y.
AbB	*Altbabylonische Briefe,* Leiden
ABL	R. F. Harper, *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters,* 14 vols. (Chicago, 1892-1914)
ABLAK	M. Noth, *Aufsätze zur biblischen Lander- und Altertumskunde,* 2 vols. (Neukirchen, 1971)
ABR	*Australian Biblical Review,* Melbourne
abs.	absolute
acc.	accusative
AcOr	*Acta orientalia,* Copenhagen, Leiden
act.	active
adj.	adjective
adv.	adverb, adverbial
AfO	*Archiv für Orientforschung,* Graz
ÄgAbh	*Ägyptologische Abhandlungen,* Wiesbaden
AGWG	*Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*
AHDO	*L'Archive de l'histoire du droit oriental,* Wetteren (Belgium)
AHw	W. von Soden, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch,* 3 vols. (Wiesbaden, 1965-81)
AION	*Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientali di Napoli*
AJBI	*Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute,* Tokyo
AJSL	*American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures,* Chicago
AKG	*Archiv für Kulturgeschichte,* Berlin
Akk.	Akkadian
Amhar.	Amharic
Amor.	Amorite
AN	J. J. Stamm, *Die akkadische Namengebung. MVÄG* 44 (1939)
AnAcScFen	*Annales Academiae Scientarum Fennicae,* Helsinki
AnBibl	*Analecta biblica,* Rome
AncIsr	R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions* (Eng. trans., New York, 1961, repr. 1965)
ANEP	*Ancient Near East in Pictures,* ed. J. B. Pritchard (Princeton, 1954, ^{2}1969)
ANET	*Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the OT,* ed. J. B. Pritchard (Princeton, ^{2}1955, ^{3}1969)
ANH	G. Dalman, *Aramäisch-Neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch* (Göttingen, ^{2}1922, ^{3}1938)
AnLov	*Analecta lovaniensia biblica et orientalia*
AnOr	*Analecta orientalia,* Rome
AOAT	*Alter Orient und AT,* Kevelaer, Neukirchen-Vluyn
AOB	*Altorientalische Bilder zum AT,* ed. H. Gressmann (Berlin, ^{2}1927)

AOS	*American Oriental Series,* New Haven
AOT	*Altorientalische Texte zum AT,* ed. H. Gressmann (Berlin, ²1926, repr. 1953)
AP	A. E. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (1923, repr. Osnabrück, 1976)
APN	K. Tallqvist, *Assyrian Personal Names. AnAcScFen* 43/1 (1914, repr. 1966)
APNM	H. B. Huffmon, *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts* (Baltimore, 1965)
Arab.	Arabic
Aram.	Aramaic
ARM	*Archives royales de Mari. Textes cunéiformes,* Paris
ArOr	*Archiv orientální,* Prague
ARW	*Archiv für Religionswissenschaft,* Freiburg, Leipzig, Berlin
AS	*Assyriological Studies,* Chicago
ASAW	*Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*
ASGW	*Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften,* Leipzig
ASORDS	*American Schools of Oriental Research Dissertation Series*
ASTI	*Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute in Jerusalem,* Leiden
AT	Altes Testament, Ancien Testament, etc.
ATA	*Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen,* Münster
ATANT	*Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments,* Zurich
ATD	*Das AT Deutsch,* ed. V. Herntrich and A. Weiser, Göttingen
ATDA	J. Hoftijzer and G. van der Kooij, *Aramaic Texts from Deir 'Alla* (Leiden, 1976)
ATR	*Anglican Theological Review,* Evanston
ATS	*Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im AT,* St. Ottilien, Munich
Aug	*Augustinianum,* Rome
AuS	G. Dalman, *Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina,* 7 vols. (1928-42, repr. Hildesheim, 1964)
AUSS	*Andrews University Seminary Studies,* Berrien Springs, Mich.
AV	Authorized (King James) Version
AzT	*Arbeiten zur Theologie,* Stuttgart
BA	*Biblical Archaeologist,* New Haven, Ann Arbor, Philadelphia, Atlanta
Bab.	Babylonian, Babylonian Talmud
BAfO	*Beiheft zur AfO*
BAH	*Bibliothèque archéologique et historique,* Paris
BAR	*Biblical Archaeology Review,* Washington, D.C.
BASOR	*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research,* New Haven, Ann Arbor, Philadelphia, Baltimore
BBB	*Bonner biblische Beiträge*
BBET	*Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie*
BC	C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Biblischer Commentar über das AT*
BDB	F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the OT* (Oxford, 1907; Peabody, Mass., ²1979)
Beeston	A. F. L. Beeston, et al., *Sabaic Dictionary* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1982)
Benz	F. L. Benz, *Personal Names in the Phoenician and Punic Inscriptions. StPohl* 8 (1972)
BeO	*Bibbia e Oriente,* Milan
BethM	*Beth Miqra,* Jerusalem
BETL	*Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium,* Paris, Gembloux
BEvT	*Beiträge zur evangelische Theologie,* Munich
Beyer	K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer* (Göttingen, 1984)
BFCT	*Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie*
BHHW	*Biblisch-historisches Handwörterbuch,* ed. L. Rost and B. Reicke, 4 vols.(Göttingen, 1962-66; index and maps, 1979)

BHK	*Biblia hebraica,* ed. R. Kittel (Stuttgart, ^{3}1929)
BHS	*Biblia hebraica stuttgartensia,* ed. K. Elliger and W. Rudolph (Stuttgart, 1966-77)
BHT	*Beiträge zur historischen Theologie,* Tübingen
Bibl	*Biblica,* Rome
bibliog.	bibliography
BibOr	*Biblica et orientalia*
Biella	J. Biella, *Dictionary of Old South Arabic, Sabaean Dialect. HSS* 25 (1982)
BietOr	*Biblica et orientalia,* Rome
BIFAO	*Bulletin de l'institut français d'archéologie orientale,* Cairo
BiKi	*Bibel und Kirche,* Stuttgart
BiLe	*Bibel und Leben,* Düsseldorf
BiLi	*Bibel und Liturgie,* Klosterneuberg
BiOr	*Bibliotheca orientalis,* Leiden
BJRL	*Bulletin of the John Rylands Library,* Manchester
BK	*Biblischer Kommentar AT,* ed. M. Noth and H. W. Wolff, Neukirchen-Vluyn
BL	*Bibel-Lexikon,* ed. H. Haag (Einsiedeln, 1951, ^{2}1968)
BLA	M. Bauer and P. Leander, *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen* (Halle, 1927)
BLe	H. Bauer and P. Leander, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des ATs* (1918-22, repr. Hildesheim, 1991)
BMAP	E. G. Kraeling, *Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri* (New Haven, 1953)
BN	*Biblische Notizen,* Bamberg
BOT	*De Boeken van het OT,* Roermond en Maaseik
BRL	K. Galling, *Biblisches Reallexikon. HAT* (1937, ^{2}1977)
BSAW	*Berichte der Sächsichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*
BSOAS	*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies,* London
BSt	*Biblische Studien,* Neukirchen-Vluyn
BT	*Bible Translator,* London
BTB	*Biblical Theology Bulletin,* Rome
BThS	*Biblisch-theologische Studien,* Neukirchen-Vluyn
BWA(N)T	*Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten (und Neuen) Testament,* Leipzig, Stuttgart
BWL	W. G. Lambert, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature* (Oxford, 1960)
BZ	*Biblische Zeitschrift,* Paderborn
BZAW	*Beihefte zur ZAW,* Berlin
ca.	circa, about
CAD	*Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (1956–)
CahRB	*Cahiers de la RB,* Paris
Can.	Canaanite
CAT	*Commentaire de l'AT,* Neuchâtel
CBC	*Cambridge Bible Commentary*
CBOT	*Coniectanea biblica, OT Series,* Lund
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly,* Washington
CBQMS	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series*
CCSL	*Corpus christianorum: Series latina,* Turnhout, 1953–
CD A,B	Damascus document, manuscript A, B
cf.	compare, see
CH	Code of Hammurabi
ch(s).	chapter(s)

ChW	J. Levy, *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim und einen grossen Theil des rabbinischen Schriftthums,* 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1867-68, repr. 1959)
CIH	*Corpus inscriptionum himjariticarum* (= *CIS,* IV)
CIJ	*Corpus inscriptionum judicarum* (Vatican, 1936–)
CIL	*Corpus inscriptionum latinarum* (Berlin, 1862–)
CIS	*Corpus inscriptionum semiticarum* (Paris, 1881–)
cj.	conjecture
CML	G. R. Driver, *Canaanite Myths and Legends* (Edinburgh, 1956; ^{2}1978, ed. J. C. L. Gibson)
col.	column
comm(s).	commentary(ies)
Conc	*Concilium*
const.	construct
ContiRossini	K. Conti Rossini, *Chrestomathia arabica meridionalis epigraphica* (Rome, 1931)
Copt.	Coptic
COT	*Commentaar op het OT,* Kampen
CPT	J. Barr, *Comparative Philology and the Text of the OT* (Oxford, 1968)
CRAI	*Comptes rendus des séances de l'Academie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres,* Paris
CSD	R. Payne Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary* (Oxford, 1903, repr. 1976)
CT	*Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum*
CTA	A. Herdner, *Corpus des tablettes en cunéiformes alphabétiques découvertes à Ras Shamra-Ugarit,* 2 vols. (Paris, 1963)
CTh	*Cahiers théologiques,* Neuchâtel
CThM	*Calwer theologische Monographien,* Stuttgart
D	Deuteronomist source
D	D (doubling) stem
DB	*Dictionnaire de la Bible,* ed. F. Vigouroux (Paris, 1895-1912)
DBS	*Dictionnaire de la Bible, *e Supplement,* ed. L. Pirot et al. (Paris, 1926–)
dir.	direct
DISO	*Dictionnaire des inscriptions sémitiques de l'ouest,* ed. C. F. Jean and J. Hoftijzer (Leiden, 1965)
diss.	dissertation
DJD	*Discoveries in the Judean Desert* (Oxford, 1955–)
DMOA	*Documenta et monumenta orientis antiqui,* Leiden
DN	deity name
Dtn	Deuteronomic source
Dtr	Deuteronomistic source
DtrN	nomistic Deuteronomistic source
DtrP	prophetic Deuteronomistic redactor
E	Elohistic source
EA	Tell el-Amarna tablets
EB	*Die Heilige Schrift in deutscher Übersetzung. Echter-Bibel,* Würzburg
ÉBib	*Études bibliques,* Paris
ed.	edition, editor
EdF	*Erträge der Forschung,* Darmstadt
EDNT	*Exegetical Dictionary of the NT,* ed. H. Balz and G. Schneider, 3 vols. (Eng. trans., Grand Rapids, 1990-93)
EgT	*Église et Théologie*
Egyp.	Egyptian

EH	*Europäische Hochschulschriften,* Frankfurt, Bern
EHAT	*Exegetisches Handbuch zum AT,* Münster
EHS	*Einleitung in die Heilige Schrift*
EMiqr	*Enṣiqlōpedyā miqrā'it (Encyclopedia Biblica),* (Jerusalem, 1950–)
EncJud	*Encyclopaedia judaica,* 16 vols. (Jerusalem, New York, 1971-72)
EnEl	Enuma Elish
Eng.	English
ERE	*Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics,* ed. J. Hastings, 13 vols. (New York, 1913-27)
Erg.	Ergänzungsheft, Ergänzungsreihe
ErIsr	*Eretz-Israel,* Jerusalem
ESE	M. Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris für semitische Epigraphik* (1900-1915)
esp.	especially
ÉtB	*Études bibliques,* Paris
Eth.	Ethiopic
ETL	*Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses,* Louvain
ETR	*Études théologiques et religieuses,* Montpellier
ETS	*Erfurter theologische Studien,* Erfurt
EÜ	Einheitsübersetzung der Heilige Schrift (Stuttgart, 1974-80)
Even-Shoshan	A. Even-Shoshan, *New Concordance of the Bible* (Jerusalem, ^{4}1983)
EvT	*Evangelische Theologie,* Munich
ExpT	*Expository Times,* Edinburgh
fem.	feminine
FF	*Forschungen und Fortschritte,* Berlin
fig(s).	figure(s)
fr(s).	fragment(s)
FRLANT	*Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments,* Göttingen
FS	Festschrift
FzB	*Forschung zur Bibel,* Würzburg
G, Gtn	basic *(Grund)* stem, reflexive stem
GaG	W. von Soden, *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik. AnOr* 33 (1952, ^{2}1969 [with Erg., *AnOr* 47])
Ger.	German
GesB	W. Gesenius and F. Buhl, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das AT* (Berlin, ^{17}1921, ^{18}1987–)
GesTh	W. Gesenius, *Thesaurus philologicus criticus linguae hebraeae et chaldaeae Veteris Testamenti,* 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1829-58)
Gilg.	Gilgamesh epic
Gk.	Greek
GK	W. Gesenius and E. Kautsch, *Hebräische Grammatik* (Halle, ^{28}1909) (= Kautsch and A. E. Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* [Oxford, ^{2}1910])
GM	*Göttingen Miszellen. Beiträge zur ägyptologischen Diskussion*
GSAT	*Gesammelte Studien zum AT*
GTA	*Göttinger theologische Arbeiten*
GTT	*Gereformeerd theologisch Tijdschrift,* Aalten, Kampen
GTTOT	J. J. Simons, *Geographical and Topographical Texts of the OT* (Leiden, 1959)
H	Holiness Code
Habil.	Habilitationschrift
HAL	L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament,* 5 vols. (Leiden, 1994-2000)

HAR	*Hebrew Annual Review,* Columbus, Ohio
HAT	*Handbuch zum AT,* ser. 1, ed. O. Eissfeldt, Tübingen
Heb.	Hebrew
Herm	*Hermeneia,* Philadelphia, Minneapolis
Hitt.	Hittite
HKAT	*Handkommentar zum AT,* ed. W. Nowack, Göttingen
HO	*Handbuch der Orientalistik,* Leiden
HP	E. Jenni, *Das hebräische Pi'el* (Zurich, 1968)
HS	*Die Heilige Schrift des ATs,* ed. F. Feldmann and H. Herkenne, 8 vols. (Bonn, 1930-31)
HSAT	*Die Heilige Schrift des ATs,* ed. E. Kautsch and A. Bertholet, 4 vols. (Tübingen, ^{4}1922-23)
HSM	*Harvard Semitic Monographs,* Cambridge
HSS	*Harvard Semitic Series/Studies,* Cambridge, Missoula, Chico, Atlanta
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review,* Cambridge
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual,* Cincinnati
IB	*Interpreter's Bible,* ed. G. A. Buttrick, 12 vols. (Nashville, 1952-57)
IBHS	B. K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Intro. to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, Ind., 1990)
ICC	*International Critical Commentary,* Edinburgh
IDB	*Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible,* ed. G. A. Buttrick, 4 vols. (Nashville, 1962); *Sup,* ed. K. Crim (Nashville, 1976)
IEJ	*Israel Exploration Journal,* Jerusalem
ILC	J. Pedersen, *Israel: Its Life and Culture,* 4 vols. in 2 (Eng. trans., Oxford, 1926-40, ^{5}1963)
ill(s).	illustration(s)
impf.	imperfect(ive)
impv.	imperative
inf.	infinitive
in loc.	on this passage
Int	*Interpretation,* Richmond
Intro(s).	Introduction(s) (to the)
IPN	M. Noth, *Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung. BWANT* 46[III/10] (1928, repr. 1980)
J	Yahwist source (J^1, earliest Yahwist source; J^S, secondary Yahwist source)
JA	*Journal asiatique,* Paris
JAC	*Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum,* Münster
Jamme	OSA inscriptions numbered according to A. Jamme
JANES	*Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University,* New York
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society,* Baltimore, Boston, New Haven
JARCE	*Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt,* Boston
JARG	*Jahrbuch für Anthropologie und Religionsgeschichte*
Jastrow	M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (1903; repr. 2 vols. in 1, Brooklyn, 1975)
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature,* Philadelphia, Missoula, Chico, Atlanta
JBTh	*Jahrbuch für biblische Theologie*
JCS	*Journal of Cuneiform Studies,* New Haven, Cambridge, Mass., Philadelphia, Baltimore
JE	Yahwist-Elohist source
JEOL	*Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap "Ex Oriente Lux,"* Leiden
Jer.	Jerusalem (Palestinian) Talmud

JHS	*Journal of Hellenistic Studies,* London
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies,* London
JM	P. Joüon and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew. Subsidia biblica* 14/I-II (Eng. trans. 1991)
JMEOS	*Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society*
JMUOS	*Journal of the Manchester University and Oriental Society*
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies,* Chicago
JNSL	*Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages,* Stellenbosch
JPOS	*Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society,* Jerusalem
JQR	*Jewish Quarterly Review,* Philadelphia
JSHRZ	*Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit,* Gütersloh
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism*
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the OT,* Sheffield
JSOTSup	*Journal for the Study of the OT, Supplement,* Sheffield
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies,* Manchester
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies,* Oxford
Jud	*Judaica,* Zurich
K	*Kethibh*
KAI	H. Donner and W. Röllig, *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften,* 3 vols. (Wiesbaden, ^{2}1966-69, ^{3}1971-76)
KAT	*Kommentar zum AT,* ed. E. Sellin and J. Herrmann, Leipzig, Gütersloh
KBL	L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros* (Leiden, ^{1}1953, ^{2}1958, ^{3}1967–96)
KEHAT	*Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum AT,* ed. O. F. Fridelin (Leipzig, 1812-96)
KHC	*Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum AT,* ed. K. Marti, Freiburg/Leipzig/Tübingen
KlPauly	*Der Kleine Pauly. Lexikon der Antike,* ed. K. Ziegler and W. Sontheimer, 5 vols. (Stuttgart, 1962-75)
KlSchr	*Kleine Schriften* (A. Alt [Munich, 1953-59, ^{3}1964]; O. Eissfeldt [Tübingen, 1962-79]; K. Elliger [*ThB* 32 (1966)]; E. Meyer [Halle, 1910-24])
König	E. König, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Wörterbuch zum AT* (Leipzig, 1910; ^{6,7}1937)
KTU	*Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit,* I, ed. M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín. *AOAT* 24 (1976)
KuD	*Kerygma und Dogma,* Göttingen
Kuhn	K. G. Kuhn, *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten* (Göttingen, 1960); Nachträge, *RevQ* 4 (1963-64) 163-234
l(l).	line(s)
Lane	E. W. Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon,* 8 vols. (London, 1863-93, repr. 1968)
LAPO	*Littératures anciennes du Proche-Orient,* Paris
Lat.	Latin
LD	*Lectio divina,* Paris
Leš	*Lešonénu,* Jerusalem
Leslau, *Contributions*	W. Leslau, *Ethiopic and South Arabic Contributions to the Hebrew Lexicon* (Los Angeles, 1958)
LexÄg	W. Helck and E. Otto, eds., *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* (Wiesbaden, 1975–)
LexHebAram	F. Zorell, *Lexicon hebraicum et aramaicum Veteris Testamenti* (Rome, 1958, repr. 1968)
LexLingAeth	A. Dillmann, *Lexicon linguae aethiopicae* (Leipzig, 1865)
LexSyr	C. Brockelmann, *Lexicon syriacum* (Halle, 1928, ^{2}1968)
Lisowsky	G. Lisowsky, *Konkordanz zum hebräischen AT* (Stuttgart, 1958, ^{2}1966)
lit.	literally

LOT	Z. Ben Ḥayyim, *The Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic Amongst the Samaritans* (Jerusalem, 1957)
LSJ	H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, and H. S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford, ^{9}1940)
LThK	*Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche,* ed. M. Buchberger, 10 vols. (Freiburg, 1930-38); ed. J. Höfer and K. Rahner, 10 vols. and 3 sups. (^{2}1957-68, ^{3}1966-68)
LUÅ	*Lunds Universitets Årsskrift*
LXX	Septuagint (LXX^{A}, Codex Alexandrinus; LXX^{B}, Codex Vaticanus; LXX^{Or}, Origen; LXX^{L}, Lucianic recension; $LXX^{S[1,2]}$, Codex Sinaiticus, correctors 1, 2, etc.)
Mand.	Mandaic
Mandelkern	S. Mandelkern, *Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae* (Tel Aviv, 1971)
MAOG	*Mitteilungen der Altorientlistischen Gesellschaft,* Leipzig
masc.	masculine
MdD	E. S. Drower and R. Macuch, *Mandaic Dictionary* (Oxford, 1963)
MEOL	*Mededelingen en Verhandelingen van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap "Ex Oriente Lux,"* Leiden
Meyer	R. Meyer, *Hebräische Grammatik,* 4 vols. (Berlin, ^{3}1966-72)
mg.	margin
MGWJ	*Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums,* Breslau
Michel	D. Michel, *Grundlegung einer hebräischen Syntax,* I (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1977)
Midr.	Midrash
MIO	*I maestri di ieri e di oggi*
Mish.	Mishnah
Moab.	Moabite
MRS	*Mission de Ras Shamra,* Paris
ms(s).	manuscript(s)
MSL	*Materialen zum sumerischen Lexikon,* Rome
MT	Masoretic Text
MTS	*Münchener theologische Studien,* Munich
Mur	Wadi Murabbaʿat text(s)
Mus	*Muséon,* Louvain
MUSJ	*Mélanges de l'Université St.-Joseph,* Beirut
MVÄG	*Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Ägyptischen Gesellschaft,* Berlin, Leipzig
n(n).	note(s)
N, Ntn	passive, reflexive stem
NBL	*Neues Bibel-Lexikon,* ed. M. Görg (Zurich, 1991)
NBSS	T. Nöldeke, *Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft* (Strassburg, 1910)
NC	*La nouvelle Clio,* Brussels
NCBC	*New Century Bible Commentary,* Grand Rapids and London
NEB	*Die Neue Echter-Bibel,* Würzburg
NedTT	*Nederlands theologisch Tijdschrift,* Wageningen
NESE	R. Degen, W. W. Müller, and W. Röllig, *Neue Ephemeris für Semitische Epigraphik,* 1972-78
NICOT	*New International Commentary on the OT,* Grand Rapids
no(s).	number(s)
NovTSup	*Novum Testamentum Supplements,* Leiden
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version (New York, 1989)
NRT	*Nouvelle revue théologique,* Louvain, Paris

NSS	J. Barth, *Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen* (^{2}1894, repr. Hildesheim, 1967)
NT	New Testament, Neues Testament, etc.
NTS	*New Testament Studies,* Cambridge
NTT	*Norsk teologisk Tidsskrift,* Oslo
obj.	object
OBO	*Orbis biblicus et orientalis,* Fribourg, Göttingen
OBT	*Overtures to Biblical Theology,* Philadelphia, Minneapolis
obv.	obverse of a papyrus or tablet
OL	Old Latin (OL^S, Fragmenta Sangallensia Prophetarum)
OLP	*Orientalia lovaniensa periodica,* Louvain
OLZ	*Orientalistische Literaturzeitung,* Leipzig, Berlin
Or	*Orientalia,* Rome
OrAnt	*Oriens antiquus,* Rome
OrS	*Orientalia Suecana,* Uppsala
OSA	Old South Arabic
OT	Old Testament, Oude Testament, etc.
OTL	*Old Testament Library,* Philadelphia, Louisville
OTS	*Oudtestamentische Studiën,* Leiden
OTWSA	*Ou testamentiese werkgemeenskap in Suid-Afrika,* Pretoria
p(p).	page(s)
P	Priestly source (P^G, Priestly *Grundschrift* ["basic material"]; P^S, secondary Priestly source)
PAAJR	*Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research,* Philadelphia
Palmyr.	Palmyrene
Pap.	Papyrus
par.	parallel/and parallel passages
pass.	passive
PEQ	*Palestine Exploration Quarterly,* London
perf.	perfect(ive)
Pes.	Pesiqta
Phil.-hist. Kl.	Philosophische-historische Klasse
Phoen.	Phoenician
PJ	*Palästinajahrbuch,* Berlin
pl(s).	plate(s)
pl.	plural
PLO	*Porta linguarum orientalium,* Wiesbaden
PN	personal name
PNPI	J. K. Stark, *Personal Names in Palmyrene Inscriptions* (Oxford, 1971)
PNU	F. Grondähl, *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit. StPohl* 1 (1967)
POS	*Pretoria Oriental Series,* Leiden
POT	*De Prediking van het OT,* Nijkerk
prep(s).	preposition(s)
PRU	*Le Palais royal d'Ugarit,* ed. C. F.-A. Schaeffer and J. Nougayrol. *MRS*
ptcp.	participle
PTMS	*Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series*
Pun.	Punic
PW	A. Pauly and G. Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft,* 6 vols. (Stuttgart, 1839-52); Sup, 11 vols. (1903-56); ser. 2, 10 vols. (1914-48)
Pyr.	K. Sethe, *Die altägyptischen Pyramidentexte,* 4 vols. (Leipzig, 1908-22)
Q	Qumran scroll (preceded by arabic numeral designating cave)
Q	*Qere*

QD	*Quaestiones disputatae,* Florence
r.	reverse (side of a tablet, coin, etc.)
R	Redactor (R^D, Deuteronomistic; R^P, Priestly; R^J, Yahwist)
RA	*Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale,* Paris
Rab.	Rabbah (midrashic commentary)
RAC	*Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum,* ed. T. Klauser (Stuttgart, 1950–)
Rahlfs	A. Rahlfs, ed., *Septuaginta* (Stuttgart, 1935)
RAI	*Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale,* Paris
RAO	H. Ringgren, *Die Religionen des Alten Orients. ATD* Erg. Sonderband (1979)
RÄR	H. Bonnet, *Reallexikon der ägyptischen Religionsgeschichte* (Berlin, 1952, ^{2}1971)
RB	*Revue biblique,* Paris
RE	*Real-Enzyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche,* ed. A. Hauck, 24 vols. (Leipzig, ^{3}1896-1913)
REJ	*Revue des études juives,* Paris
repr.	reprint, reprinted
RES	*Répertoire d'épigraphie sémitique* (Paris, 1900–) (with number of text)
rev.	revised, revision
RevQ	*Revue de Qumrân,* Paris
RGG	*Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Tübingen, ^{2}1927-31, ed. H. Gunkel and L. Zscharnack, 5 vols.; ^{3}1957-65, ed. K. Galling, 6 vols.)
RHA	*Revue Hittite et Asianique,* Paris
RHPR	*Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses,* Strasbourg, Paris
RivB	*Rivista biblica,* Rome
RLA	*Reallexikon der Assyriologie,* ed. E. Ebeling and B. Meissner (Berlin, 1932–)
RM	*Die Religion der Menschheit,* Stuttgart
RS	Ras Shamra text
RSF	*Revista di studi fenici*
RSO	*Rivista degli studi orientali,* Rome
RSP	*Ras Shamra Parallels: The Texts from Ugarit and the Hebrew Bible,* ed. L. R. Fisher et al., I, *AnOr* 49 (1972); II, *AnOr* 50 (1975); III, *AnOr* 51 (1981)
RSPT	*Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques,* Paris
RSR	*Recherches de science religieuse,* Paris
RST	*Regensburger Studien zur Theologie*
RT	*Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie Égyptiennes et Assyriennes,* Paris
RTAT	*Religionsgeschichtliches Textbuch zum AT,* ed. W. Beyerlin, *ATD* Erg. 1 (1975)
Ryckmans	G. Ryckmans, *Les noms propres sud-sémitiques,* 3 vols. (Leiden, 1934-35)
Sab.	Sabaic
Saf.	Safaitic
SAHG	A. Falkenstein and W. von Soden, *Sumerische und akkadische Hymnen und Gebeten* (Zurich, 1953)
Sam.	Samaritan
SANT	*Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament,* Munich
SAT	*Die Schriften des ATs in Auswahl,* ed. H. Gunkel and H. Gressmann, 7 vols. (Göttingen, ^{2}1920-22)
SB	*Sources bibliques,* Paris
SBB	*Stuttgarter biblische Beiträge*
SBFLA	*Studii biblici franciscani liber annus,* Jerusalem
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLDS	*SBL Dissertation Series,* Missoula, Chico, Atlanta

SBLMS	*SBL Monograph Series,* Missoula, Chico, Atlanta
SBLSBS	*SBL Sources for Biblical Study*
SBM	*Stuttgarter biblische Monographien*
SBS	*Stuttgarter Bibel-Studien*
SBT	*Studies in Biblical Theology,* London, Naperville
ScrHier	*Scripta hierosolymitana,* Jerusalem
SEÅ	*Svensk exegetisk Åarsbok,* Lund
Sem.	Semitic
Sem	*Semitica,* Paris
Seux	J. M. Seux, *Epithètes royales akkadiens et sumériennes* (Paris, 1967)
sg.	singular
SgV	*Sammlung gemeinverständlicher Vorträge und Schriften,* Tübingen
SJLA	*Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity,* Leiden
SJT	*Scottish Journal of Theology,* Edinburgh
SNTSMS	*Society for NT Studies Monograph Series,* Cambridge
Soq.	Soqoṭri
SR	*Studies in Religion/Sciences religieuses,* Toronto
SSAW	*Sitzungsberichte der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig,* Phil.-hist. Kl.
SSN	*Studia semitica neerlandica,* Assen
ST	*Studia theologica,* Lund, Århus, Riga
St.-B.	H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum NT aus Talmud und Midrasch,* 6 vols. (Munich, 1922-61)
STDJ	*Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah,* Leiden, Grand Rapids
StOr	*Studia orientalia,* Helsinki
StPohl	*Studia Pohl,* Rome
subj.	subject
subst.	substantive
suf.	suffix
Sum.	Sumerian
SUNT	*Studien zur Umwelt des NTs,* Göttingen
Sup	Supplement(s) (to)
s.v.	*sub voce (vocibus),* under the word(s)
SVT	*Supplements to VT,* Leiden
Synt	C. Brockelmann, *Hebräische Syntax* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1956)
Syr.	Syriac
Syr	*Syria. Revue d'art oriental et d'archéologie,* Paris
T.	Testament
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the NT,* ed. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, 9 vols. plus index vol. (Eng. trans., Grand Rapids, 1964-76)
TDOT	*Theological Dictionary of the OT,* ed. G. J. Botterweck, H. Ringgren, and H.-J. Fabry (Eng. trans., Grand Rapids, 1974–)
Tg.	Targum; Frag. Tg., Fragmentary Targum; Tg. Jon., Targum Jonathan from Codex Reuchlinianus; Tg. Neof., Targum Neofiti; Tg. Onq., Targum Onqelos; Tg. Ps.-J., Targum Pseudo-Jonathan
TGI	K. Galling, *Textbuch zur Geschichte Israels* (Tübingen, 1950, ^{2}1968, ^{3}1979)
Tham.	Thamudic
ThArb	*Theologische Arbeiten,* Berlin
ThAT	*Theologie des ATs*
THAT	*Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum AT,* ed. E. Jenni and C. Westermann, 2 vols. (Stuttgart, 1971-76)
ThB	*Theologische Bücherei,* Munich
ThS	*Theologische Studien,* Zurich

ThV	*Theologische Versuche,* Berlin
ThWNT	*Theologisches Wörterbuch zum NT,* ed. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, 10 vols. plus index (Stuttgart, 1933-79)
ThZ	*Theologische Zeitschrift,* Basel
Tigr.	Tigriña
TLZ	*Theologische Literaturzeitung,* Leipzig, Berlin
TM	Tell Mardikh-Ebla tablets
TO	A. Caquot, M. Sznycer, and A. Herdner, *Textes ougaritiques. I. Mythes et légendes. LAPO,* 2 vols. (Paris, 1974-89)
TOB	Traduction oecuménique de la Bible (Paris, 1983)
Tomback	R. S. Tomback, *A Comparative Lexicon of the Phoenician and Punic Languages* (Missoula, 1978)
Tos.	Tosephta
trans.	translation, translated by
TRE	*Theologische Realenzyklopädie,* ed. G. Krause, G. Müller, and H. R. Balz, 22 vols. (Berlin, 1977-92)
TRev	*Theologische Revue,* Münster
TRu	*Theologische Rundschau,* Tübingen
TSK	*Theologische Studien und Kritiken,* Hamburg, Gotha, Leipzig
TSSI	J. C. L. Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions,* 3 vols. (Oxford, 1975-82)
TTK	*Tidsskrift for teologi og kirke,* Oslo
TTS	*Trierer theologische Studien*
TTZ	*Trierer theologische Zeitschrift*
TUAT	*Texte aus der Umwelt des ATs,* Gütersloh
TW	*Theologische Wissenschaft*
TynB	*Tyndale Bulletin,* London
TZ	*Theologische Zeitschrift,* Basel
UF	*Ugarit-Forschungen,* Neukirchen-Vluyn
Ugar.	Ugaritic
Univ.	University
ÜPt	M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* (Stuttgart, 1948)
Urk	*Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums,* ed. G. Steindorff (Leipzig, Berlin, 1903–)
UT	C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook. AnOr* 38 (1965, ^{2}1967)
UTB	*Uni-Taschenbücher*
UUÅ	*Uppsala universitets årsskrift*
v(v).	verse(s)
VAB	*Vorderasiatische Bibliothek,* 7 vols. (Leipzig, 1907-16)
VD	*Verbum domini,* Rome
VG	C. Brockelmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen,* 2 vols. (1908-13, repr. Hildesheim, 1961)
Vg.	Vulgate
VT	*Vetus Testamentum,* Leiden
Wagner	M. Wagner, *Die lexikalischen und grammatikalischen Aramaismen im alttestamentlichen Hebräisch. BZAW* 96 (1966)
WbÄS	A. Erman and H. Grapow, *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache,* 6 vols. (Leipzig, 1926-31, repr. 1963)
WBC	*Word Biblical Commentary,* Waco, Dallas, Nashville
WbMyth	*Wörterbuch der Mythologie,* ed. H. W. Haussig (Stuttgart, 1965–)
WBTh	*Wiener Beiträge zur Theologie*
WbTigr	E. Littmann and M. Höfner, *Wörterbuch der Tigre Sprache* (Wiesbaden, 1962)

WdF	*Wege der Forschung*
Wehr	H. Wehr, *A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic,* ed. J. M. Cowan (Ithaca, 1961, ^{3}1971, ^{4}1979)
Whitaker	R. E. Whitaker, *A Concordance of the Ugaritic Language* (Cambridge, Mass., 1972)
WMANT	*Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament,* Neukirchen-Vluyn
WO	*Die Welt des Orients,* Göttingen
WTM	J. Levy, *Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim,* 4 vols. (Leipzig, ^{2}1924, repr. 1963)
WuD	*Wort und Dienst,* Bielefeld
WUNT	*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum NT,* Tübingen
WUS	J. Aistleitner, *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache. BSAW,* Phil.-hist. Kl. 106/3 (1963, ^{4}1974)
WZ Halle	*Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg,* Halle
YOS	*Yale Oriental Series, Babylonian Texts*
ZA	*Zeitschrift für Assyriologie,* Leipzig, Berlin
ZAH	*Zeitschrift für Althebräistik*
ZÄS	*Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde,* Leipzig, Berlin
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft,* Giessen, Berlin
ZBK	*Zürcher Bibelkommentare,* Zurich, Stuttgart
ZDMG	*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft,* Leipzig, Wiesbaden
ZDPV	*Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins,* Leipzig, Stuttgart, Wiesbaden
Ziegler	J. Ziegler, ed., *Septuaginta* (Göttingen, 1931–)
ZKT	*Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*
ZS	*Zeitschrift für Semitistik*
ZTK	*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche,* Tübingen
ZZ	*Die Zeichen der Zeit*
→	cross-reference within this Dictionary
<	derived from
>	whence derived, to
*	theoretical form

TRANSLITERATION

VOWELS

◌ַ	a
◌ֲ	^{a}
◌ָ	ā
◌ָה	â
◌ָיו	āyw
◌ַי	ay
◌ָי	āy
◌ֶ	e
◌ֱ	^{e}
◌ֶי	ey
◌ֵ	ē
◌ֵי	ê
◌ְ	^{e}
◌ִ	i
◌ִי	î
◌ִיּ	îy
◌ָ	o
◌ֳ	^{o}
◌ֹ	ō
וֹ	ô
◌ֻ	u, ū
וּ	û

CONSONANTS

א	'
בּ	b
ב	ḇ
גּ	g
ג	ḡ
דּ	d
ד	ḏ
ה, הּ	h
ו	w
ז	z
ח	ḥ
ט	ṭ
י	y
כּ, ךּ	k
כ, ך	ḵ
ל	l
מ, ם	m
נ, ן	n
ס	s
ע	'
פּ	p
פ, ף	p̄
צ, ץ	ṣ
ק	q
ר	r
שׂ	ś
שׁ	š
תּ	t
ת	ṯ

קוץ *qôṣ*

I. Etymology. II. Occurrences. III. Usage: 1. Plants; 2. Enemies. IV. LXX.

I. Etymology. Outside Hebrew, *qôṣ* is scarcely attested as a word for thorny plants. It is found in Samaritan; it also appears in Egyptian as *qd,* and possibly in Akkadian as *giṣṣu(m).*[1] Aram. *qôṣ* in the sense of "cut"[2] is more likely related to *qôṣ* II, assumed to have a similar meaning.[3] We may therefore agree with *HAL* that *qôṣ* is a primary noun.

II. Occurrences. The noun *qôṣ* appears in Gen. 3:18; Ex. 22:5(Eng. 6); Jgs. 8:7,16; 2 S. 23:6; Ps. 118:12; Isa. 32:13; 33:12; Jer. 4:3; 12:13; Ezk. 28:24; Hos. 10:8. It does not appear in Sirach, although the verb *qûṣ* (unrelated to *qôṣ*) does occur there. In the Dead Sea Scrolls the noun appears only in 1QH 8:25.

III. Usage.

1. *Plants.* The majority of texts use *qôṣ* in the literal sense as a term for a kind of plant. The frequent occurrence of *dardar,* "thistle," in the immediate context suggests a spiny plant or thorn, not more precisely identifiable.[4]

In all occurrences of *qôṣ,* its connotations are uniformly negative, in both literal and figurative usage. This negative burden is clear from the frequent use of *qôṣ* in threats of punishment. The menace is due not so much to the plant's sharp spines as to the problems thorns (often in conjunction with thistles) pose for agriculture; but cf. Jgs. 8:7,16, where thorns are mentioned as instruments of corporal punishment.

Thorns are seen as something that makes agriculture a vexation (as in Gen. 3:18, where thorns and thistles are instruments of Yahweh's punishment). In a similar vein Isa. 32:13 threatens that the soil will be overgrown with thorns and briers — again in response to disobedience described in the preceding verses (note the similarity to Isa. 5:1-7). In Jer. 12:13 reaping thorns where wheat was sown — i.e., hard work in the fields for nothing (cf. Gen. 3:18) — is likewise understood as a punishment sent by Yahweh.

---

qôṣ. O. Becker, "Ps 118,12 דֹּעֲכוּ כְּאֵשׁ קוֹצִים," *ZAW* 70 (1958) 174; G. Dalman, *AuS,* II (1932), esp. 326-27; H. Frehen, "Distel," *BL*², 339-40; O. Keel, M. Küchler, and C. Uehlinger, *Orte und Landschaften der Bibel,* I (1984), esp. 72-74; T. Schlatter, "Dornen und Disteln," *Calwer Bibellexikon* (⁵1959), 218-19; H. Schmoldt, "Pflanzenwelt," *Reclams Bibellexikon* (1978), 389-90; S. Wibbing, "Dornen," *BHHW,* I, 350-51; M. Zohary, *Plants of the Bible* (Eng. trans. London, 1982).

1. *HAL,* III, 1090.
2. Beyer, 682.
3. *HAL,* III, 1090.
4. Schmoldt, 390; Schlatter, 218; Frehen, 339; on the wide variety of thorny plants see Zohary, passim.

Hos. 10:8 leaves the immediate realm of agriculture and threatens that the altars on the high places will be overgrown with thorns and thistles. This is clearly perceived as an extraordinary punishment. "The image of thorns and thistles recalls 9:6 and reawakens the associations of that text with the exodus. For their 'growing' the author uses a verb that normally refers to the 'offering' of sacrifices on the altars, thus presenting to the reader a striking image of the altars' end."[5] In 1QH 8:25, too, the growth of thorns and thistles is threatened as a punishment.

Ex. 22:5(6) deals with the case of a fire set through negligence in the thorny brush surrounding a field, thereby endangering the crop. The one who started the fire is to make full restitution. This is the only text in which thorns are perceived positively as a protective enclosure.

2. *Enemies.* The noun *qôṣ* is used metaphorically for hostile alien peoples and what befalls them. Isa. 33:12 compares the fate of the peoples to thorns that are cut down and burned in a fire, destroyed because they are of no value. This image envisions the total annihilation of those attacking Zion.[6] We also find *qôṣ* and *'ēš* together in Ps. 118:12, probably again referring to enemies. The text of this verse has been the subject of scholarly debate. Many propose to emend *dō'ᵃḵû* in v. 12aβ to *bā'rû* for the sake of parallelism with v. 12aα. Becker, however, following a reading proposed by G. R. Driver and accepted by Köhler, prefers to understand *qôṣ* as wick trimmings. The point of the text, then, is that "the threat represented by the enemy is so insignificant that the psalmist can easily keep it at bay." But this can be the point of the text even without emendation or finding another meaning than "thorns";[7] if thorns are burned, the image can still suggest a fire that goes out if it does not find new fuel.[8] Following a prophecy of judgment against Sidon, Ezk. 28:24 promises Israel that it will no longer experience its enemies as a piercing thorn, because they shall be destroyed.

The wicked in general are the subject of 2 S. 23:6, where the noun *bᵉlîya'al*[9] (probably to be understood collectively) is associated with *qôṣ:* the godless will be like (scattered) thorns, which no one will pick up and which are consigned to flames. Jer. 4:3 demands better conduct on the part of the people of Judah: the possibility of repentance is open, and they should not sow among thorns. From the context this can mean only that their conduct must not be determined by evil (cf. v. 4); what is needed instead is "a radical change of mind."[10] This passage presupposes the negative denotation and connotation of *qôṣ* exemplified in the texts already examined (clearly representing more common usages) but deliberately takes a different approach.

---

5. J. Jeremias, *Hosea. ATD* XXIV/1 (1983), 131.

6. O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1974), 346.

7. On the problems associated with emendation see H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans. 1989), 394.

8. H. Schmidt, *Psalmen, HAT* XV (1934), 213.

9. → II, 135.

10. W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* XII ([3]1968), 31; see also J. Schreiner, *Jeremia. NEB* 33.

IV. LXX. The most frequent LXX translation of *qôṣ* is *ákantha.* We also find various attempts at transliteration, such as *hakkṓs, kṓs,* etc.

Hausmann

קָטֹן *qāṭōn;* קָטָן *qāṭān;* קֹטֶן *qōṭen*

I. 1. Occurrences, Etymology, Meaning; 2. LXX. II. Usage: 1. Impersonal; 2. Personal.

I. 1. *Occurrences, Etymology, Meaning.* There are 108 occurrences in the OT (Hebrew only) of words belonging to the *qāṭōn* group. The commonest are the adjs. *qāṭān* (47 occurrences plus a PN in Ezr. 8:12) and *qāṭōn* (54 occurrences; vocalization analogous to that of *gāḏôl*[1]). There are only 4 occurrences of the verb (3 in the qal, 1 in the hiphil). The noun **qōṭen* occurs twice. There are also 5 occurrences of the adj. *qāṭān* in Sirach.

The word group derives from a Common Semitic root with the meaning "be thin, be narrow." We therefore find etymologically related words in most of the Semitic languages: Akkadian,[2] Syriac,[3] Mandaic,[4] Old South Arabic,[5] and Ethiopic.[6] For Ugaritic,[7] Punic,[8] and Egyptian Aramaic,[9] the evidence is scanty and uncertain. For Arabic only *qaṭîn,* "servant," is a possible derivative; but the situation is different in the modern South Arabic dialects.[10] Besides the OT, the word group is found in Middle Hebrew and Jewish Aramaic;[11] it occurs rarely in the Dead Sea Scrolls (one Aramaic occurrence in 1QapGen 20:5). In several languages we find nominal forms used as personal names or nicknames[12] reflecting the physical stature of the person in question.

---

qāṭōn. O. Bächli, "Die Erwählung des Geringen im AT," *TZ* 22 (1966) 385-95; F. Bron, "Sur un emprunt sémitique en grec et en latin," *Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes* 59 (1985) 95-96; W. Brueggemann, "Amos' Intercessory Formula," *VT* 19 (1969) 385-99; B. Lifshitz, "Beiträge zur palästinischen Epigraphik," *ZDPV* 78 (1962) 64-88; H. Schult, "Vergleichende Studien zur alttestamentlichen Namenkunde" (diss., Bonn, 1967), esp. 122-23.

1. *BLe,* 466, with n. 2.
2. *CAD,* Q, 163-64; *AHw,* II, 907.
3. *LexSyr,* 659.
4. *MdD,* 88, 410.
5. Beeston, 109.
6. *LexLingAeth,* 470; *WbTigr,* 262.
7. *HAL,* III, 1092.
8. *DISO,* 257.
9. *KAI,* 270B.6.
10. *HAL,* III, 1093.
11. Jastrow, 1326, 1348, 1350-51; for Samaritan see *LOT,* II, 586.
12. *HAL,* III, 1093; see also *MdD,* 406; Hebrew nickname: *DISO,* 257; Lifshitz, 67-69.

The basic meaning cited above is also determinative for the word group in the OT. It generally refers to the small size of an animate or inanimate object; it can also be used figuratively to modify abstract nouns. Only rarely, however, does it refer to size in a neutral sense; inherent in the word group is the negative connotation "be negligible, be weak." This is where its semantic core lies. Reference to a physical dimension is not even necessary. The small physical stature of children has also led to the meaning "young" for the adjs. *qāṭān* and *qāṭōn,* referring to the absolute or relative ("younger, youngest") age of a person (primarily in Hebrew), always with evaluative overtones.

The word group → צָעִיר *ṣāʿîr* has a very similar semantic range — especially the adjective, which is often used in parallel with *qāṭān* or *qāṭōn,* with which it is virtually interchangeable (cf. Gen. 48:14 with 48:19; see also 1 S. 9:21;[13] Isa. 60:22). Thus the latter can be used as antonyms of → בכור *bᵉḵôr,* which is usually contrasted with *ṣāʿîr,* denoting the legal status of a later child in contrast to the firstborn (cf. Gen. 27:15; 48:18-19). This aspect, however, is clearly secondary; *ṣāʿîr* is the direct correlative to *bᵉḵôr,* as we see when we compare Gen. 29:16,18, where the emphasis is on the difference in ages, with v. 26, where it is on legal status. The real antonym is *gāḏôl,*[14] which covers the entire semantic range of both adjectives and therefore stands most often in antithesis to them (cf. the contrastive use of the verbs in Am. 8:5). In the majority of texts, however, we are dealing with polar expressions used to indicate a totality (32 occurrences, of which 24 refer exclusively and 1 in part to persons; persons are also referred to in 11QT 21:6). In these cases the contrast serves merely to comprehend a totality as such, and the specific meaning of the word group is present only indirectly at best.

2. *LXX.* The LXX translates *qāṭān* and *qāṭōn* with *mikrós* and *neṓteros,* occasionally employing a comparative or superlative form of *mikrós* or using some other word (*ptōchós* in Est. 1:20). Its equivalent for the qal of the verb is *(kata)smikrýnein;* in Gen. 32:11(Eng. 10) it uses the passive of *hikanoún.* For the hiphil it uses a construction with *poieín.* The noun **qōṭen* is represented in 1 K. 12:10 by *mikrótēs,* in 2 Ch. 10:10 by *mikrós dáktylos.*

II. Usage.

1. *Impersonal.* That the word group is generally used evaluatively in the sense "be inferior, be weak," is especially clear when it describes objects, animals, or abstractions. For example, Gen. 1:16 characterizes the moon as being a weaker source of light than the sun. The little ewe lamb in 2 S. 12:3 and the little cake in 1 K. 17:13 are signs of the social or economic inferiority of persons living in poverty or assailed by adversity (but see the discussion of 2 S. 12:3 below). The small roof chamber in 2 K. 4:10, although furnished substantially and placed at Elisha's disposal by a family of means

---

13. On the text see H. J. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis. KAT* VIII/1 (1973), 196.
14. → גדל *gāḏal* II.2.

(cf. v. 8), can serve only as a modest temporary shelter. Only Ezk. 43:14, in the context of an altar's dimensions, speaks neutrally of a smaller architectural feature.

Even more pejorative is the statement that some object or abstraction is too small and therefore inadequate or not sufficiently important. At the dedication of the temple, for example, Solomon did not offer the sacrifices on the bronze altar because it was too small for the vast quantities to be offered (1 K. 8:64). Here the construction with *min* makes this circumstance clear on a grammatical level. In the following passage this is not the case; the context, however, suggests the same meaning. A dishonest merchant uses a small measure (Dt. 25:14) in order to charge the same price for a smaller quantity than would be contained in a larger (accurate) measure. For the price charged, it is too small. The hiphil of the verb in Am. 8:5 conveys the same meaning. Sir. 14:3 states that riches are inappropriate (→ נאה *n'h*) for a small heart, i.e., for a small-minded person. Such a person's heart (mind) is too small to deal with wealth. Because Moses is overburdened, minor cases are not important enough for him to handle personally (Ex. 18:22,26).[15] What Yahweh has already done for David is still too trivial *(qṭn)* in Yahweh's eyes; David is therefore promised a great future (2 S. 7:19; 1 Ch. 17:17). On the other hand, according to Sir. 39:20, nothing is too small *(mᵉʿaṭ)* or insignificant to attract God's attention.

Under certain circumstances, of course, smallness can be a positive quality. For example, the little ewe lamb (2 S. 12:3) referred to above is the object of special affection precisely because it is all that the poor man has, just as the little robe in 1 S. 2:19 is an expression of special solicitude.[16] The smaller weight in Dt. 25:13 represents the norm, whereas the larger serves to defraud.[17] According to Isa. 54:7, the terrible period of the exile is but a brief moment in comparison to the coming age of salvation. If a small request, a modest favor, is asked of the king, one can expect that he will grant it (1 K. 2:20).

A paradox is frequently presented. Small creatures, although outwardly weak, can be extremely wise, in which case they are anything but helpless and insignificant (Prov. 30:24-28).[18] Measured by the standard of what it produces, the bee is a very important creature (Sir. 11:3).[19] Small foxes can inflict enormous damage on an entire vineyard and thus represent a serious threat (Cant. 2:15). This text refers metaphorically to erotic relations between the sexes: girls look on boys as small but dangerous beasts of prey intent on abusing their charms. All these texts deal with phenomena that are outwardly small or insignificant but by virtue of their potential are highly powerful and influential and must be judged from that perspective.

Finally, there are phenomena that are small at the outset but later prove to be much larger and more powerful. Thus the modest beginning *(yôm qᵉṭannôṯ)* of work on re-

15. → דבר *dāḇār* IV.3.

16. See II.2.a below.

17. On the interpretation of this text see the discussion of Am. 8:5 by W. Rudolph, *Amos. KAT* XIII/2 (1971), 263.

18. For a detailed discussion of this text see O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos. BK* XVII (1983), 365-66.

19. On the textual problems of this verse see G. Sauer, *JSHRZ* III/5, 531.

building the temple must be seen and judged on the basis of its future completion (Zec. 4:10a).[20] Similarly, the small cloud in 1 K. 18:44 is the harbinger of heavy rain and as such is a very significant sign.

The idea expressed in Isa. 22:24-25 is unique. Small vessels, each very light, can add up to a deadly weight when taken en masse. The text uses this image for the family clients of a powerful individual, whose fall they occasion even though they destroy themselves in the process.

2. *Personal.*

a. *Individuals.* When describing persons, the adjs. *qāṭān* and *qāṭōn* serve primarily to indicate that someone is young(er). This qualification is pejorative in principle. If the reference is to childhood or adolescence — apart from the physical soundness of a young child, which is clearly desirable (2 K. 5:14) — the implication is that the individual is weak, immature, and helpless. Solomon calls himself a little boy to make clear that he is not yet capable of ruling the kingdom inherited from David.[21] Elisha is jeered by small boys, i.e., boys who are immature and unable to recognize his true greatness (2 K. 2:23). The little boy or young man *(na'ar)* that Jonathan used to give David a secret signal acts with childish naivete (1 S. 20:35; cf. vv. 36-39). According to Cant. 8:8, it is the responsibility of (adult) brothers to weigh the future of their little sister, who is still a child and as such not competent to make judgments.

When used in a comparative sense, both adjectives refer to the younger of two brothers or sisters (Jgs. 3:9 [interpreted secondarily as referring to a single individual; cf. 1:13 and the discussion in the following section); 1 S. 14:49). This difference in age also implies a difference in status. A younger brother (Gen. 27:15,42) is fundamentally inferior to his elder brother, because the latter is the firstborn (*bᵉḵôr,* 27:19,32). On the same principle, according to 29:15-30, a younger daughter (vv. 16,18) may not be married before her elder sister (v. 26),[22] even if she is the more attractive (vv. 17,18a). Jgs. 15:2 may also reflect the assumption that the younger daughter is inferior to the elder, although the point at issue here is not a question of status but rather of voluntary indemnification for an unlawfully annulled marriage.

The word group also conveys a pejorative sense even when a specific age or relative seniority is not suggested. For example, Dt. 1:17 refers to the socially powerless, who can easily be at a disadvantage in court. In 1QS 5:23 and 6:2, the text deals with members of the Qumran community whose knowledge or behavior assigns them an inferior status; they are therefore obliged to obey their superiors. Only the personal name in Ezr. 8:12 probably refers to small stature without serious disparagement.[23]

The general association of smallness with weakness and inferiority does not, however, rule out the possibility that the person in question can be of special value or consequence. This is illustrated above all by the texts that contrast a youngest son to sev-

---

20. On *hā'eḇen habbᵉḏîl* see W. Rudolph, *Sacharja 1–8. KAT* XIII/4 (1976), 114-15.
21. → נער *na'ar* III.3.
22. On the use of *ṣᵉ'îrâ* see I.1 above.
23. See I.1 above.

eral elder brothers, usually representing him as being still a child. As such a figure, Benjamin plays an important role in the Joseph story (Gen. 42:13,15,20,32,34; 43:29; 44:2,12,23,26; cf. 44:20). His father has a special affection for him because he believes him to be the only surviving son of one of his wives (44:18-31). But Benjamin also enjoys this affection as the youngest son, still a child, who is weaker and more vulnerable than his elder brothers and is therefore treated with greater tenderness and solicitude. Another expression of such solicitude appears in 1 S. 2:19 (cf. vv. 20-21): the little robe Samuel's mother sends him each year while he is her only child.

Another passage singles out the youngest as the sole survivor when his brothers were murdered — probably on the assumption that he was too small to be noticed (Jgs. 9:5). The special position of such a survivor is clear from 2 Ch. 21:17 and 22:1, where the king's youngest son succeeds to the throne, so that it is through him that the dynasty and his father's line are preserved.

The story of Hadad, the Edomite prince, probably likewise assumes that his tender age facilitated his escape to Egypt during David's campaign against the Edomites (1 K. 11:15-17), so that he remained a potential pretender to the throne. To the opposition, the Davidic rulers of Edom, he represented a danger — temporarily latent but long-term and therefore all the greater (cf. vv. 21ff.). In 2 S. 9:12 the mention of Mephibosheth's (Merib-baal's) young son, a descendant of Saul, may suggest a corresponding danger to David and his dynasty.

More important is the paradoxical role played by the youngest, the immature, or the lowly in general when Yahweh shows them his loving favor and sets them apart for a special purpose. The story of David and Goliath (1 S. 17) is an example. Although David is the youngest and not qualified to fight (v. 14), he accomplishes a deed that overshadows all the experienced warriors, including his elder brothers (v. 28). This text is not literarily homogeneous;[24] one section (vv. 12-30) presents David's success as a fairy-tale motif, demonstrating that extraordinary feats can be accomplished by the very people human judgment would find totally unfit for the task.[25] The larger context, however, makes a theological statement. It is Yahweh who makes David's feat possible, using a young child to demonstrate his boundless power and giving Israel's history an unexpected turn. The same point is made by 1 S. 16:1-13, where Yahweh singles out none of the older brothers but rather the youngest, who is still a child (v. 11), to be the future king (cf. 11QPs^a 28:3 = Ps. 151A:1[26]). Speaking in general terms, without reference to age or brothers, 1 S. 15:17 says that Yahweh anointed Saul king even though he was little in human terms. The same point is made by 1 S. 9:21;[27] here, however, Saul expresses his own unworthiness by citing the lowly status of his tribe, a rhetorical commonplace (cf. Jgs. 6:15).

In this context we may also cite 2 K. 5, in which a young girl, serving as a captive slave (v. 2) — i.e., a person of very low status — bears witness to the power of the

24. For its analysis see comms.
25. H. Gunkel, *Das Märchen im AT* (Tübingen, ^{2}1987), 122-23.
26. J. A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11. DJD,* IV (1965), 49.
27. On the text see I.1 above.

prophet Elisha, thus helping a mighty Aramean find healing for his disease. Jacob's personal relationship with Yahweh, not his status in the eyes of others, is at issue in Gen. 32:11(10), where he maintains that he has been too little (*qṭn* qal) in the course of his lifetime to be worthy of Yahweh's steadfast love and favor.

The thought of wisdom literature embodies different criteria. Here childhood and youth as a whole take on very special significance, because during that stage the essential decisions are made that will determine behavior in later life. Young people must therefore be subject to strict discipline, including corporal punishment, to guide them on the correct way (Sir. 30:12, the only occurrence of *qāṭān* in such a context[28]). According to Sir. 51:26, by contrast, it is the personal responsibility of all young people to address themselves to wisdom and thus decide for the correct way.

Finally, there are texts where the extraordinary strength and power of a group are illustrated by its weakest members. The military superiority of Assyria is exemplified by the fact that even the most junior officer has at his disposal forces far surpassing those of the enemy (2 K. 18:24; Isa. 36:9). Just such a person is the best demonstration of Assyrian superiority. The same holds true for the bravery of the Gadites in 1 Ch. 12:15(14), which also describes the accomplishments of the mightiest as the maximum. Military might as a sign of divine blessing is probably the issue in 4QM^a 13:2,[29] in the sense of the promise in Lev. 26:8. The paradisal peace of the coming age of salvation is the point of Isa. 11:6; its perfection is illustrated by the fact that a little child (an extremely weak and vulnerable individual), domestic animals, and beasts of prey can share the same field.

The noun *qōṭen* is used analogously in 1 K. 12:10 (par. 2 Ch. 10:10). Here the superiority of an individual is demonstrated figuratively by the extraordinary size of an especially small portion of his body (little finger or penis).[30]

b. *Collectives.* When a collective is called small, this means that it is few in number and therefore has little power. Normally, a small city cannot hold out against a large army (Eccl. 9:14). Yahweh will make Edom small (Ob. 2; Jer. 49:15), i.e., he will strip Edom of its previous power and surrender it to its foes (cf. Ob. 3-4).[31]

Am. 7:2 and 5 refer to natural catastrophes in the face of which Jacob (i.e., Israel) is totally helpless. The emphatic statement that Jacob is small probably suggests the image of a young child who is weak and needs special care and protection.[32] Brueggemann argues unconvincingly that this passage alludes to the Jacob traditions of Genesis and the theology of the covenant.[33]

Collectives can also be qualified genealogically. Identification of a clan's ancestor as a younger brother (Jgs. 1:13) implies that the clan is numerically smaller and less powerful. The same holds true for families (1 Ch. 24:31b[34]) and also for cities, which

---

28. For a discussion of similar texts see → יסר *yāsar* III.4, IV.
29. M. Baillet, *Qumrân grotte 4.III. DJD,* VII (1982), 35.
30. *HAL,* III, 1093; on the LXX translation see I.2 above.
31. On 1 S. 9:21 see II.2.a above.
32. See II.2.a above.
33. P. 391 n. 2.
34. W. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher. HAT* XXI (^{3}1968), 164-65.

can be personified as sisters (Ezk. 16:46,61). The Canaanites are characterized as a people of low degree by an ancestry traced to Noah's youngest son (Gen. 9:24 — albeit the emphasis in v. 25 is on condemnation to slavery as punishment for a particular offense on the part of the ancestor).[35]

On the other hand, the promise of a host of offspring to the youngest in Isa. 60:22 means that even the smallest families or clans will multiply on an astonishing scale, exemplifying the future greatness of Israel. When Gen. 48:19 describes the younger brother as being greater than the firstborn (cf. v. 18), this means that the smaller of two tribes eventually outstripped the larger (analogously to Jacob in Gen. 27).

Such a change of roles can hardly reflect the realities of family size. We are dealing here with a reflection of historical processes involving people and tribes, which are understood as (indirect) interventions by God (in the sense of demonstrations of God's power by the youngest or lowliest[36]). The only element derived from family life is the priority of the firstborn.[37]

Conrad

---

35. → כנען *kᵉnaʿan.*
36. See II.2.a above.
37. → בכור *bᵉḵôr* III.2.d.

קטר *qṭr;* קִיטוֹר *qîṭôr;* *מִקְטָר *miqṭār;* מִקְטֶרֶת *miqṭereṯ;* קְטֹרָה *qᵉṭōrâ;* קְטֹרֶת *qᵉṭōreṯ*

I. 1. Etymology and Meaning; 2. Ugaritic; 3. OT; 4. LXX and Dead Sea Scrolls. II. 1. Sacrifice in General; 2. Prohibitions; 3. Mandatory and Freewill Offerings.

---

qṭr. W. F. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel* (repr. Garden City, 1969⁵); idem, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* (Garden City, 1968); H. F. Beck, "Incense," *IDB,* II, 697-98; G. W. van Beek, "Ancient Frankincense-Producing Areas," in R. LeBaron Bowen, ed., *Archaeological Discoveries in South Arabia* (1958), 139-42; *idem,* "Megiddo," *IDB,* III, 335-42; J. P. Brown, "The Sacrificial Cult and Its Critique in Greek and Hebrew (II)," *JSS* 25 (1980) 1-21; T. A. Busink, *Der Tempel von Jerusalem,* I (1970); U. Cassuto, *Comm. on the Book of Exodus* (Eng. trans. Jerusalem, 1967); D. Conrad, "Zu Jes 65:3b," *ZAW* 80 (1968) 232-34; G. H. Davies, "Fire and Cloud," *IDB,* III, 817; R. Degen, "Der Räucheraltar aus Lachisch," *NESE,* I, 39-48; W. Dietrich, *Israel und Canaan. SBS* 94 (1979); G. R. Driver, "Three Technical Terms in the Pentateuch," *JSS* 1 (1956) 97-105; R. Dussaud, *Les origines cananéennes du sacrifice israélite* (Paris, 1921); K. Elliger, "Chammanim = Masseben?" *ZAW* 57 (1939) 256-65; K. Galling, "Baʿal

I. 1. *Etymology and Meaning.* The base *qṭr* appears frequently in the OT, both as a verb and in nominal forms. Its basic meaning, "burn" and "produce smoke," is assured by its occurrences in the other Semitic languages.[1] Akk. *qatāru* means "be smoky," and in the D stem "make an incense offering";[2] cf. also *qutru(m),* "smoke," and *qutrēnum, qutrinnu,* "incense (offering)."[3] Arab. *qatara* means "be smoky, fragrant" (cf. the noun *quttār,* "smoke"). Eth. *qĕtārē* means "incense."[4]

2. *Ugaritic.* Ugar. *qṭr* occurs 6 times with the meaning "mist, breath."[5] In 3 passages it refers to the breath or mist emerging from the nose of Aqhat, a sign that he is still alive.[6] More significant are three other occurrences that Gibson translates as "spirit," adding, however, that the noun can also mean "incense."[7] If this latter interpretation is right, then all the texts that speak of Aqhat's *qṭr* rising from the earth refer to an incense offering for the deceased. We may be dealing with a specific funeral rite, obviously performed in the vicinity of the house. This could be a sacrifice to or for the spirit of the departed as a purification rite for his entrance into the netherworld.[8]

Hammon in Kition und die Hammanîm," *Wort und Geschichte. FS K. Elliger. AOAT* 18 (1973), 65-70; T. H. Gaster, "Sacrifices and Offerings, OT," *IDB,* IV, 147-59; N. Glueck, "Incense Altars," *Translating and Understanding the OT. FS H. G. May* (1970), 325-29; N. Groom, *Frankincense and Myrrh* (London, 1981); M. Haran, "The Uses of Incense in the Ancient Israelite Ritual," *VT* 10 (1960) 113-29; R. K. Harrison, *Healing Herbs of the Bible* (Leiden, 1988); F. N. Hepper, "Arabian and African Frankincense Trees," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 55 (1969) 66-72; R. de Langhe, "L'autel d'or du temple de Jérusalem," *Bibl* 40 (1959) 476-94; M. Löhr, *Das Räucheropfer im AT* (1927); W. W. Müller, "Weihrauch," *PW Sup* XV (1977), 700-777; K. Nielsen, *Incense in Ancient Israel. SVT* 38 (1986); M. O'Dwyer-Shea, "The Small Cuboid Incense-Burner of the Ancient Near East," *Levant* 15 (1983) 76-109; J. B. Pritchard, "On the Use of the Tripod Cup," *Ugaritica,* VI (1969), 427-34; M. Rehm, "Das Opfer der Völker nach Mal 1,11," *FS H. Junker* (1961), 193-208; R. Rendtorff, *Studien zur Geschichte des Opfers im alten Israel. WMANT* 24 (1967); H. Schmökel, "Zur kultischen Deutung des Hohenliedes," *ZAW* 64 (1952) 148-55; R. O. Steuer, "Stactē in Egyptian Antiquity," *JAOS* 63 (1943) 279-84; J.-M. de Tarragon, *Le culte à Ugarit. CahRB* 19 (1980); M. Tsevat, "Studies in the Book of Samuel I," *HUCA* 32 (1961) 191-216; O. Tufnell, *Lachish II-III* (Oxford, 1940-53); E. Unger, "Altar," *RLA,* I, 73-75; R. de Vaux, *Studies in OT Sacrifice* (Eng. trans. Cardiff, 1964); H. M. Wiener, *The Altars of the OT* (Leipzig, 1927); K. Wigand, "Thymiateria," *Bonner Jahrbücher* 122 (1913) 1-97; W. Zwickel, *Räucherkult und Räuchergeräte. OBO* 97 (1990). → זבח *zāḇaḥ,* → מנחה *minḥâ,* → עולה/עלה *ʿōlâ/ʿôlâ.*

1. In addition to the following examples see *HAL,* III, 1094.
2. *AHw,* II, 907.
3. *AHw,* II, 930.
4. *LexLingAeth,* 442.
5. Whitaker, 548.
6. *KTU,* 1.18, IV, 26, 37; 1.19, II, 44. See *WUS,* no. 2404. Citing the parallel use of *qṭr* and *rḥ npš, TO,* I, 422, interprets *qṭr* as "vital principle."
7. The texts are *KTU,* 1.17, I, 27, 46; II, 1. See *CML*[2], 104. Cf. also *UT,* no. 2220: "smoke, incense."
8. J. C. de Moor, *An Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit* (Leiden, 1987), 228, likewise suggests a connection with funeral rites, but in a different manner.

3. *OT.* In the OT the verb *qṭr* appears in the piel (41 times) and hiphil (69 times), as well as the pual (once) and hophal (twice). In the piel it means "send an offering up in smoke," while the hiphil has the more specialized meaning "burn an incense offering." On this basis the hiphil in 1 S. 2:15-16, which is meant to denote the burning of the fat portions *(ḥeleḇ),* should be emended to a piel.[9] The burning of offerings and incense appears in both licit and illicit forms. To the extent that the texts refer to the latter at all, few details emerge concerning the rite in question. Sometimes such rites were performed "in the streets" of the city, but more often "on the high places";[10] in the latter case they are also derogated as offerings to other gods.

The noun *qîṭôr* occurs four times in the general sense of "smoke," as the smoke of a burning city (Gen. 19:28 [twice]). It may also refer to the fumes of a volcano (Ps. 148:8), although here an emendation to "frost" is sometimes suggested.

The noun *miqṭār* denotes an "incense stand" or "incense altar" on which incense was burned (Ex. 30:1); *miqṭereṯ* has a similar meaning (Ezk. 8:11; 2 Ch. 26:19; cf. 30:14).

The most frequently occurring noun is *qᵉṭōreṯ,* which refers to the smoke of a sacrifice and more frequently to the burning of incense (61 times). The latter usage predominates in the OT, possibly to the exclusion of other meanings, since the burning of aromatic spices often accompanied animal sacrifices. According to Wellhausen, not until Ezekiel does *qᵉṭōreṯ* take on the specialized meaning "incense offering."[11] In this sense *qᵉṭōreṯ* can refer to both the material offered (normally defined as *sammîm,* "fragrant perfumes"[12]) and the ritual of offering (*qᵉṭōreṯ tāmîḏ,* Ex. 30:8).

The noun *qṭrt* appears twice in Punic inscriptions, where it refers to incense offerings or sweet-smelling aromatics.[13]

The term most often used in parallel with *qᵉṭōreṯ* is → לבנה *lᵉḇōnâ,* "frankincense";[14] a strict distinction seems to be impossible. Since the OT repudiates many aspects of the use of incense, it is noteworthy that the noun *ḥammān* appears as a term for an incense altar[15] in the very contexts that refer to incense offerings incompatible with the worship of Yahweh. This noun can be taken as a term for small incense stands associated with cultic activities rejected by Yahwism.[16]

4. *LXX and Dead Sea Scrolls.* The LXX translates *qṭr* with *thymiázein/thymián* (over 60 times), *anaphérein* (24 times), and *(epi)thýein* (13 times). It normally translates *qᵉṭōreṯ* with *thymíama,* but sometimes expands the semantic domain by using *sýnthesis* (3 times).[17]

---

9. H. J. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis. KAT* VIII/1 (1973), 108.
10. → במה *bāmâ.*
11. J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* (⁶1927), 63 n. 2. But cf. Haran, 114.
12. *HAL,* II, 759.
13. *DISO,* 257; cf. also 130.
14. → VII, 444-45.
15. *HAL,* I, 329.
16. Albright, *Archaeology,* 76-77, 142, 216 n. 58.
17. Nielsen, 52-53.

In the Dead Sea Scrolls *qᵉṭōreṯ* appears in 4QFlor 1:6, in a quotation from Dt. 33:10 regarding the official duties of the Levites. The verb appears only in the Temple Scroll (20 times), important evidence supporting the theory that the Temple Scroll may not come from Qumran.[18] For the Temple Scroll *qṭr* is an important sacrificial term: at the dedication festival, offerings and libations are to be burned on the altar (11QT 16:6,9,18; cf. Ex. 29; Lev. 8). Offerings including the memorial or token portion are also burned at the festival of new wine (11QT 20:4,7,11), the festival of new oil (22:6,7), the festival of new olives (23:10,11,16; 24:4), and the Day of Atonement (26:8; cf. Lev. 16; 23:27-32; Nu. 29). The verb also appears several times in descriptions of the structures round about the temple used for preparing the offerings (11QT 32:7; 33:15; 34:11,13). 11QT 52:21 is a digression from Dt. 12:20-28.

II. 1. *Sacrifice in General.* The piel of *qṭr* means "let an offering go up in smoke" in general. In 1 S. 2:15,16,28, for example, the offering of sacrifices to God in this manner is described as a fundamental function of the priesthood, in this case the sons of Eli.[19] The account makes clear that the burning of the "fat portions" (*ḥeleḇ,* v. 15) produced the thick smoke and acrid odor. We find a similar reference in Am. 4:5, which lists burning a thank offering *(tôḏâ)* among the fundamental obligations of the lay Israelite.[20] Isa. 1:13 and Ps. 66:15 also allude to the meaning of *qᵉṭōreṯ* as the smoke and odor accompanying the burning of the fat portions of a sacrifice. As a summary term for the offering of sacrifices that involved burning all or part of the sacrificial gifts, we find *qᵉṭōreṯ* in Ex. 30:20; 2 K. 16:13,15; 2 Ch. 32:12.[21]

In Lev. 1:9,13,17, etc., *hiqṭîr* stands for the burning of the "burnt offering" *(ʿôlâ)* on the altar of Yahweh. In the case of the "grain offering" (*qorbān minḥâ,* Lev. 2:1ff.), a portion of the offering is set aside, mixed with *lᵉḇōnâ* (v. 2), and then burned on the altar as a "token portion" (*'azkārâ,*[22] Lev. 2:2,9,16). According to Nu. 5:5-31, as part of the ordeal to determine whether a woman is guilty of adultery, the law requires such a grain offering. The *'azkārâ* portion is burned on the altar (v. 26). Portions of the sacrifice of well-being (*šᵉlāmîm,* Lev. 3:9-11) are also to be burned on the altar (vv. 11,16). In all these cases *qṭr* describes the act of burning the sacrificial portions on the altar — the fat portions in the case of animals, the aromatic portions in the case of grain offerings. There is nothing to suggest that *qṭr* is limited to the offering of the aromatic portions.[23]

Lev. 4:10,19,26,31,35; 5:12 also use *hiqṭîr* to describe the burning of the fat portions of the sin offering *(ḥaṭṭā'ṯ).* Such a sin offering is required as part of the rites for conse-

18. H. Stegemann, "The Origin of the Temple Scroll," *SVT* 40 (1988), 235-56.
19. See I.3 above.
20. H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos. Herm* (Eng. trans. Philadelphia, 1977), 220.
21. Rendtorff, 110-11.
22. → זכר *zāḵar.*
23. Rendtorff, 187; de Vaux, 27ff.

crating Aaron and his sons as priests (8:16,20,21,28). The sacrificial portions are defined precisely (v. 25). The same procedure is to be followed in the case of the guilt offering (*'āšām,* 7:5,31). The burning ritual is required for both offerings (9:10,13,14,17, 20; 16:25; 17:6; cf. Ex. 29:13,18,25; Jer. 33:18).

Behind the burning of all or part of the burnt offering lies the idea of transferring to God the vital force of the sacrificial victim. In the other forms of sacrifice, especially the grain offering, in which no animal is sacrificed, the precise purpose of the burning is unclear; it was probably borrowed from the animal sacrifice by analogy. In any case the burning ritual was already long established before any attempt was made to reduce to writing the laws governing sacrifice. The grain to be offered was mixed with aromatics to produce a pungent, pleasing odor; this may have something to do with the name *'azkārâ* given to a portion of the offering. An element of purification may have been involved; and just as food for humans is often made savory with the aid of spices, this technique may have been applied to offerings for God. It is therefore unlikely that burning the whole offering or a portion of it served a single purpose. It has been suggested that the production of pungent smoke was intended to attract the attention of the deity, but there is evidence that the fire was considered a means of returning to the deity the power of the material sacrificed.

2. *Prohibitions.* In some passages *hiqṭîr* stands for unauthorized and strictly forbidden ritual acts. The biblical disapproval leaves open the question whether the prohibition applies to incense offerings alone or to the burning of sacrificial offerings accompanied by the burning of aromatics. The offering of such sacrifices is frequently described as taking place in a sanctuary; often, however, it is thought of as a much simpler action taking place in a house. In the latter case we are probably dealing with the burning of aromatics as a form of incense offering.

Despite the harsh polemic, the texts do not make clear why such sacrifices are an abomination to Yahweh. The burning of incense is itself considered an offensive act, but nothing else is clear. From many passages it emerges that such incense offerings to other gods provoke Yahweh's wrath. It is a typically Dtr concern to condemn the rite of burning offerings or incense in the context of a more extensive polemic (against Baal or other foreign gods). On the one hand, therefore, the alien cult component is grounds for the polemic. Other passages, however, show that the offering of incense itself was a widespread form of sacrifice practiced in private homes without priestly supervision. On this point, therefore, the unqualified status of those offering the sacrifice was uncongenial to the religion of Yahweh. It remains an entirely speculative question whether in some passages the offering of incense was associated with some kind of narcotic effect.

The best place to begin our examination of the texts impugning the burning *(qiṭṭēr)* of sacrificial offerings or incense is with those that are markedly Dtr. These occurrences are decidedly formulaic and refer to offering incense on high places (1 K. 22:44[43]; 2 K. 12:4[Eng. 3]; 15:4,35; 16:4; 17:11; 23:5). Chronicles singles out the conduct of King Ahaz for particular criticism (2 Ch. 28:4,25) in this respect. Naturally such offerings were made to Yahweh, the God of Israel. This is clearly implied, for example, in the

case of the offerings made to the bronze serpent[24] in the temple of Yahweh in Jerusalem. It was not until Hezekiah that this cultic image was removed (2 K. 18:4).

Comparable to these Dtr occurrences are the offerings on the hills spoken of in Hos. 4:13; the mention of cultic images clearly shows these offerings were made to Baal (cf. 11:2). Other Dtr passages (2 K. 23:5; Jer. 7:9; 11:13,17) refer likewise to such offerings to Baal. Offerings to other gods are mentioned in 2 K. 22:17; Jer. 1:16; 11:12; 18:15; 19:4; 44:3,5,8. Jeremiah accuses the women of Judah who have fled to Egypt of having made burnt offerings to other gods (Jer. 44:15), especially the "queen of heaven" (vv. 15,17,19), and continuing to do so. The Dtr polemic in the book of Jeremiah also condemns the women in Jerusalem, who had done the same thing in the streets of the city (44:21,23). If these charges can be taken literally, they probably refer to a private form of incense offering, possibly in conjunction with apotropaic or even funeral rites. There is also a noun *qiṭṭēr* in 44:21, probably having to do with aromatics burned as incense.

This Dtr polemic reappears in 2 Ch. 34:25; 26:16,18(twice),19. According to the Chronicler, Amaziah made offerings to the gods of the Edomites (2 Ch. 25:14).

Besides these passages, the OT contains a variety of texts that prohibit the burning of incense in specific situations. Ezk. 8:11 condemns the seventy elders of Israel (mentioning Jaazaniah son of Shaphan by name) for secretly offering incense to the images of the gods. Possibly this alludes to the burning of narcotic substances (cf. v. 12); elsewhere, however, the rite seems to be associated with the cult of Yahweh. Isa. 65:3 (cf. also v. 7) rebuffs those Israelites who offer incense "on bricks/stones," which probably points to rites performed on the roofs of private houses. Isa. 65:7 refers more conventionally to rites performed "on the mountains." Finally, Prov. 27:9 appears to refer to a private use of incense along with oil to rejoice the heart. In Ezk. 16:18 and 23:41, the burning of incense serves to produce a pleasant aroma and cleanse the air. But here too Ezekiel's complex figurative language leads one to suspect a reference to illicit use of incense. The private use of incense as perfume and to produce a pleasant aroma is also attested in Cant. 3:6. Hab. 1:16 condemns the Babylonian soldiers for censing "their seines" (= weapons or banners).[25]

Clearly 2 Ch. 26:16-21 condemns Uzziah's offering of incense as a cultic act profoundly hostile to Yahweh. Although a layman, he stood with censer in hand to make an offering (v. 19) and even made bold to enter the temple (v. 16), though forbidden to do so; he was therefore stricken with leprosy.

A series of Priestly texts likewise stigmatizes the illicit use of incense. Lev. 10:1-7 speaks of the sin of Nadab and Abihu, who took "strange [NRSV 'unholy'] fire" *('ēš zārâ)* to offer incense; as a result, they are both consumed by fire from the altar of Yahweh. A similar punishment is recorded in Nu. 16:1-35: 250 Israelite men, under the leadership of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, offered an illicit incense offering (see esp. v. 35). The narrative is undoubtedly composite, combining several different original

24. → נחשתן *nᵉḥuštān.*
25. W. Rudolph, *Habakuk. KAT* XIII/3 (1975), 210-11.

themes.[26] Neither the offering of incense nor the possibility of a foreign religion is at issue; the criticism focuses solely on the fact that these men are not priests of Aaronic descent and therefore cannot legitimately make an offering before Yahweh.

The Chronicler's account of Uzziah's illness makes clear that such incense offerings enjoyed great popularity among the laity well into the postexilic period.

This ubiquitous condemnation demonstrates the prominence of this kind of offering as a popular form of devotion. It was simple to carry out; the aromatics used were costly but easily accessible. No special priests were needed. The aromas produced were considered sufficiently significant to attract the attention of the deity. Therefore such a rite was considered the equal of prayer in simplicity and effectiveness.

3. *Mandatory and Freewill Offerings.* The burning of incense came to occupy a fundamental place in Israel in the postexilic period, when the cult was completely systematized. But there is evidence that it was also a popular and widespread element of the preexilic cult. This is clearly attested by the great number of incense altars, usually of pottery, brought to light by archeology.[27]

The account of the building of Solomon's temple also mentions paraphernalia for censing (1 K. 7:50). According to Albright, even the freestanding temple pillars Jachin and Boaz served as large incense stands or pans.

The noun *qᵉṭōreṯ* denotes both the incense and its ritual use. Not until Ezekiel, however, do we find incontestable evidence for the existence of such a rite.[28] Possibly the practice was not effectively regulated, a state of affairs that accords with the multitude of polemical passages in the Dtr literature of the 6th century. Such regulation was attempted by the cultic legislation of Exodus and Leviticus, which describe a specific rite for the temple cult. Twice a day there was a regular offering of incense (Ex. 30:7-8).

Ex. 30:1-16 gives instructions for making an incense altar (cf. Ex. 31:8; 35:15; 37:25; 39:38; 40:5; Lev. 4:7; 1 Ch. 6:34[49]; 28:18). According to Ex. 30:3, it is to be overlaid with pure gold, and service at this altar is reserved solely to the Aaronic priesthood (Nu. 4:16; 2 Ch. 2:3[4]; 13:11; 29:7). The offering of incense later came to accompany the sacrifice of a bull as a sin offering on the Day of Atonement (Lev. 16:12-13). Noth believes that the mention of this special altar for the offering of incense is not part of the original material of P^G, but represents a later addition.[29] This theory accords with the knowledge that in earlier times incense was offered in small ceramic incense altars that could be held in the hand or in metal incense pans with long handles. It is possible but not certain that P^G knew nothing of any incense offerings. Then the desire to maintain a central place in the temple for incense offerings goes hand in hand with the prohibition against letting anyone outside the Aaronic priesthood offer incense.

Precise regulations for the incense offering appear in Ex. 30:30-38, where private

26. M. Noth, *Numbers. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1968), 120-29.
27. See Glueck.
28. See Haran.
29. M. Noth, *Exodus. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1962), 234-35.

observance of similar rites is strictly prohibited (v. 37). This is in line with the condemnation of illicit incense offerings in v. 9. The ingredients for making incense are listed in 35:8,28 (cf. 31:11; 37:29). Finally, the offering of incense according to these regulations is described in Nu. 7 (13 occurrences).

Clements

קיא *qy'*; קִיא *qî'*

I. Etymology. II. Occurrences. III. Usage. IV. LXX.

I. Etymology. Outside Hebrew, the root *qy'* appears in Akkadian as *gâ'u/kâ'u,*[1] in Arabic as *qā'a,* and in Ethiopic as *qē'a,*[2] always with the meaning "spew, vomit."

II. Occurrences. The verb appears 9 times in the OT plus once in Sirach (3 times in the qal, 7 times in the hiphil). The noun *qî'* appears 3 times and its by-form *qē'* once.

III. Usage. The hiphil of the verb is used quite literally in Jon. 2:11(Eng. 10): the large fish "spewed" Jonah out. The other occurrences, representing figurative usage, can generally be divided into three groups.

The first group represents the holy land as a living being that cannot endure sinners but "vomits them out." This is the case with the four occurrences in H (qal, Lev. 18:28; hiphil, 18:25,28; 20:22). Those who defile the land by an immoral life have impugned the purity or holiness of the land and cannot continue to dwell there: the land will vomit them out. This befell the previous inhabitants of the land and it will befall the Israelites if they do not keep the commandments.

The second group speaks of vomiting as a phenomenon associated with drunkenness. Isa. 28:8 uses the noun *qî'* literally in a drastic description of the drinking bouts of the Judahite blasphemers: "All tables are covered with filthy vomit; no place is clean." In Jer. 25:27 the nations are summoned to drain the cup of Yahweh's wrath: "Drink, get drunk and vomit, fall and rise no more."[3] Here and in v. 16 intoxication symbolizes the consequences of God's judgment; reeling and vomiting vividly represent the powerlessness of those affected. The only question is whether vv. 27-29 are secondary or represent a variant of v. 16.[4]

Isa. 19:14 likewise uses the noun figuratively: Egypt, overcome by disaster, staggers around like a drunkard in his vomit. "The aimlessness of their [Egypt's] action is dra-

1. *AHw,* I, 284.
2. *LexLingAeth,* 459.
3. → VII, 103.
4. For the former see W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* XII (^{3}1968), 167-68. For the latter see W. L. Holladay, *Jeremiah 1. Herm* (1986), 672-73.

matically compared with the behavior of a drunken man who staggers round helplessly in his vomit."[5]

According to Jer. 48:26, Moab is to be made drunk and forced to wallow in its own vomit; it is unclear whether *sāp̱aq* here should be interpreted as a verb meaning "vomit"[6] or should be connected with *śāp̱aq*, "overflow." In any case Moab is to be made a laughingstock because it has vaunted itself against Yahweh.

The third group of texts appear in wisdom contexts, pointing out that gluttony can lead to vomiting. The straightforward warning in Prov. 25:16 cautions against eating too much honey, which causes vomiting. It is possible to have too much of a good thing. This is probably also the point of Sir. 31(34):21, which uses the impv. *qᵉwēh:* if you are overstuffed with delicacies, you should vomit them out; then "you will have relief." In Job 20:15 Zophar says that the wicked must vomit up again the riches they have swallowed; they cannot keep them down. The text even says that God will cast these riches out of their bellies. Prov. 23:8 is more obscure. The saying in vv. 6-8, which parallels ch. 11 of the Instruction of Amenemope, seems to caution against eating food provided by someone who is envious; if you discover your host's insincerity, you will have to vomit up what you have eaten, and "you will have wasted the pleasant words . . . that you have just spoken as a guest."[7] Amenemope, too, mentions "vomiting," but in an entirely different context. Possibly the obscurity is the result of too radical an abbreviation of the original.[8]

Prov. 26:11 does not fit in any of these three groups: "Like a dog that returns to its vomit is a fool who reverts to his folly." Fools are incorrigible and will keep repeating their stupidity.

IV. LXX. The LXX usually uses *(ex)emeín.* In Leviticus we find *prosochthízein* and in Jon. 2:11(10) *ekbállein.* In Jer. 48:26 *epikroúein* probably reflects an original *sāp̱aq.* Isa. 28:8 has a different text.

Ringgren

5. O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1974), 104.
6. Rudolph.
7. O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos. BK* XVII (1983), 272.
8. H. Ringgren, *Sprüche. ATD* XVI (^{3}1980), 89.

קִינָה *qînâ;* קִין *qîn*

I. Etymology. II. Occurrences. III. LXX. IV. Origin. V. Literal Usage. VI. Figurative Usage: 1. Prophetic *qînôṯ;* 2. Imperatives; 3. Threat; 4. Ezk. 2:10. VII. Metrics. VIII. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Etymology. In no Semitic language antedating Hebrew do we find a lexeme corresponding to Heb. *qînâ* and the denominative verb *qîn* (or *qwn*[1]) that is based on the same root. Wetzstein and after him Budde propose associating *qînâ* with Arab. *qâna,* "forge," arguing that the basic meaning of the stem is "make by artifice, compose."[2] For *qînâ* this refers to the form (Wetzstein) or content (Budde). Despite the well-attested meaning "fashion, create" for Arab. *qâna,*[3] the question remains whether it would not be preferable to distinguish derivatives of the radicals *qn,* associated with the realm of metalworking,[4] from derivatives belonging to the realm of singing and making music. Among the latter, *HAL* cites nouns and verbs in Syriac (*qanqēn,* "sing"; *qintā,* "hymn, lament"), Mandaic (*qinta,* "hymn"), Ethiopic (*qānaya,* "make music"; *qĕnē,* "song"), Tigre (*qānā,* "invent a melody, sing"), and Arabic (*qainat,* "female singer, maid").[5] An Aramaic cognate appears in Hatra 43:3; 77:1: *rb qynt,* "master of song";[6] from the small textual basis the noun might be either *qyny*'1, "smith," or *qyny*'2, "musician."[7]

This evidence suggests that Heb. *qînâ* was also chanted, although we can say nothing about rhythm and melody[8] or any instrumental accompaniment (although the flute has been suggested because of Jer. 48:36[9]). That we should think of the *qînâ* as chanted is confirmed by Am. 8:10 and 2 Ch. 35:25, which associate *qînâ* and *qônēn* with the root → שִׁיר *šîr.*

---

qînâ. K. Budde, "Das hebräische Klagelied," *ZAW* 2 (1882) 1-52; *idem,* "Die hebräische Leichenklage," *ZDPV* 6 (1883) 180-94; O. Eissfeldt, *Einleitung in das AT* (^{4}1976), esp. 122-31; W. R. Garr, "The Qinah," *ZAW* 95 (1983) 54-75; C. Hardmeier, *Texttheorie und biblische Exegese. BBET* 79 (1978); P. Heinisch, *Die Totenklage im AT. Biblische Zeitfragen* 13/9-10 (1931); J. Hempel, *Die althebräische Literatur und ihr hellenistisch-jüdisches Nachleben* (Potsdam, 1930), esp. 27-30; E. Jacob, "Mourning," *IDB,* III, 452-54; H. Jahnow, *Das hebräische Leichenlied im Rahmen der Völkerdichtung. BZAW* 36 (1923); J. C. de Moor, "The Art of Versification in Ugarit and Israel," *Studies in Bible and the Ancient Near East. FS S. E. Loewenstamm,* 2 vols. (Jerusalem, 1978), 1:219-39; H.-P. Müller, "Gilgameschs Trauergesang um Enkidu und die Gattung der Totenklage," *ZA* 68 (1978) 219-39; G. Rinaldi, "Alcuni termini ebraici relativi alla letteratura," *Studia Biblica et Orientalia,* I = *AnBibl* 10 (1959), 133-55, esp. 150-51 (cf. *idem, Bibl* 40 [1959] 284-85); J. Scharbert, *Der Schmerz im AT. BBB* 8 (1955), esp. 121-22; W. H. Shea, "David's Lament," *BASOR* 221 (1976) 141-44; *idem,* "The *qinah* Structure of the Book of Lamentations," *Bibl* 60 (1979) 103-7; K.-D. Schunck, "Leichenlied," *BHHW,* II, 1069-70; G. Stählin, "θρηνέω/θρῆνος," *TDNT,* III, 150-51; E. F. de Ward, "Mourning Customs in 1,2 Samuel," *JJS* 23 (1972) 1-27, 145-66, esp. 155-59; J. G. Wetzstein, "Die syrische Dreschtafel," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 5 (1873) 270-302, esp. 294-302; G. A. Yee, "The Anatomy of Biblical Parody," *CBQ* 50 (1988) 565-86.

1. Scharbert, 122.
2. Wetzstein, 297 n. 1; Budde, "Klagelied," 28; cf. also H. L. Ginsberg, *BASOR* 72 (1938) 13.
3. A. Wahrmund, *Handwörterbuch Arabisch-Deutsch,* II (Beirut, 1970), 546.
4. See *HAL,* III, 1097, s.v. קין II.
5. *Ibid.,* 1096-97, s.v. קין and קנה.
6. Hatra 43:3; 77:1; A. Caquot, *Syr* 32 (1955) 50-51.
7. *Ibid.,* 271.
8. For the modern period see, e.g., A. Musil, *Arabia Petraea,* III (1908), 446; P. Kahle, *Eucharisterion. FS H. Gunkel,* 2 vols. (Göttingen, 1923), 1:367 n. 3.
9. Jahnow, 80.

II. Occurrences. The 17 canonical occurrences of the noun *qînâ* (plus 1 occurrence in Sir. 38:16) and also the 8 occurrences of *qîn* are concentrated in the prophets Jeremiah (4), Amos (2), and above all Ezekiel (2 of the verb, 4 of the noun). There are 3 occurrences in the historical books (2 in 2 Samuel and 1 in 2 Ch. 35:25). This distribution also suggests the proportion of texts that use the *qînâ* in its original sense[10] and the prophetic texts that use it figuratively.[11]

This distinction is probably also reflected in the two constructions *qônēn ('eṯ-qînâ)* (2 S. 1:17; 3:33; Ezk. 27:32; 32:16) and *nāśā' qînâ* (Am. 5:1 [where the original text can be reconstructed as *šim'û haqqînâ 'ᵃšer 'ānōḵî nōśē' 'ᵃlêḵem*[12]]; Jer. 7:29; 9:9[Eng. 10]; Ezk. 19:1; 26:17; 27:2,32; 28:12; 32:2). The word *qônēn* is a technical term for the ceremonial chanting of a dirge, whereas *nāśā'* suggests a derivative use of the genre, which does not require singing or other regular performance techniques. Seen in this light, Ezk. 32:16, despite being an example of derivative usage, requires proper performance of the *qînâ;* this interpretation is reinforced by the observation that the verse is addressed to the women of the *gôyîm,* an allusion to the special role of women in chanting a *qînâ.*[13] Only Ezk. 27:32 displays synonymous use of both formulations.

The construction *'āmar bᵉqînâ* in 2 Ch. 35:25a diverges from this usage. Since the male and female court singers are the subject of the sentence, the verb must refer to the subject matter of the *qînâ* — it tells of *('al)* Josiah — rather than its mode of performance. Some translations (e.g., EÜ) gloss over the difference.

III. LXX. The LXX translates *nāśā' qînâ* with *(ana)lambánō thrēnon* (except Jer. 9:9[10], *kopetón*), *qônēn* with *thrēnéō.*

IV. Origin. Scholars generally agree that the OT *qînâ* is totally secular and therefore quite distinct from the lament addressed to God.[14] There is no clear evidence, however, that this secular usage developed out of the Canaanite lament for the deceased deity, which the Israelites could not adopt because they considered Yahweh the God of life.[15]

The genre probably emerged initially from lamentation over the death of a family member, possibly that of a sister for her brother.[16] Müller speaks more generally of a "family or dynasty ritual."[17] The theory that the initial form of the *qînâ* was a cry of "alas" (→ הוֹי *hôy*) with the addition of a term of relationship or a title for honor (Jer. 22:18) must be treated cautiously, since no OT text explicitly represented as a *qînâ* uses the particle *hôy.* Such texts begin instead with words like *'ēḵ* (2 S. 1:19b; Ezk. 26:17),

---

10. See V below.
11. See VI below.
12. G. Fleischer, "Von Menschenverkäufern, Baschankühen und Rechtsverkehrern" (diss., Bonn, 1988), 2.3.2.
13. See IV below.
14. C. Westermann, *Forschung am AT. ThB* 55 (1974), 251-52.
15. Hempel; F. F. Hvidberg, *Weeping and Laughter in the OT* (Eng. trans. Leiden, 1962), 124.
16. Jahnow, 66-67.
17. P. 237.

kî (Jer. 9:20[21]), and the interrogative particles *mâ* (Ezk. 19:2) and *mî* (Ezk. 27:32). This usage suggests that the elegy as a poetic work of art is distinct from the short, stereotyped cry of woe.[18]

It is harder to differentiate between *qînâ* and *n^e^hî,* especially because both occur together (Jer. 9:9,19[10,20]; cf. vv. 16-17[17-18]). Kraus distinguishes between the *n^e^hî* (which he associates with the cry of woe) as the lamentation of the next of kin and the *qînâ* as the lament of others.[19] Observing that the *n^e^hî* never appears as an actual funeral lament, Hardmeier concludes that, in contrast to the secondary use of the *qînâ,* this term refers from the outset to the song of woe that victims of a calamity sing on their own behalf.[20] In fact, Hardmeier has put his finger on the only recognizable difference: the *qînâ* addresses the departed (or in figurative usage the "defunct" nation), while in the *n^e^hî* survivors of a disaster lament their own situation. This difference argues against simply calling the two words synonyms.[21]

In the setting of its primary usage, the cry of woe was probably always uttered by those affected; the elegy, however, required artistic skill and therefore became the domain of specialists, especially women (Jer. 9:16,19[17,20]; Ezk. 32:16). The parallel between *m^e^qôn^e^nôṯ* and *ḥ^a^ḵāmôṯ* in Jer. 9:16(17) suggests that the development of a specialized guild was due not only to the requirements of musical and poetical ability but also to the requirement of skill at magic. But the step from this position to finding animistic roots for the *qînâ* (exorcism of the spirit of the departed) must remain conjectural.[22]

The purpose of the *qînâ* was to stimulate the tears of those affected by someone's death (2 S. 1:24; 3:34; Jer. 9:17). As a rule the *qînâ* was taken up alongside the bier of the departed in the family home or at the tomb.

V. Literal Usage. The only OT text in which this original setting is still recognizable is 2 S. 3:33. At the grave of Abner, David takes up his lament — in which, however, he does not follow the custom of praising the virtues of the deceased, but rather takes up the theme of his assassination. Less clear is the situation of David's *qînâ* over the fallen Saul and Jonathan in 2 S. 1:17-27: the author of the Court History of David clearly came upon it independent of its original context (v. 18; on *sēp̱er hayyāšār* cf. also Josh. 10:13) and included it in the present narrative. The passage displays the following structure: account of the death of Saul and Jonathan (vv. 1-10); spontaneous mourning by David and his followers (vv. 11-12; denoted by → ספד *sāpaḏ!*); slaying of the messenger (vv. 13-16); *qînâ* for the fallen. This sequence is noteworthy for both the double expression of David's grief and the separation of the *qînâ* from vv. 11-12 (note the catchwords common to vv. 12b and 19,25,27) by vv. 13-15. These observations cast doubt on the unity of ch. 1. It is also possible to question the unity of the *qînâ*

18. Hardmeier, 215-19.
19. H.-J. Kraus, *ZAW* 85 (1973) 19-23.
20. Pp. 333-39.
21. As does Müller, 234.
22. Jahnow, 43, 71.

itself, which is framed (vv. 19b,27) and divided (v. 25) by the refrain *'êḵ nāp^e^lû gibbôrîm* (vv. 19b,27). The second section, more personal than the first, concentrates on Jonathan. Stolz believes that this section was the starting point and was expanded by the addition of vv. 19-24.[23] The refrain may also mark an alternation between solo and chorus, although this mode of performing a *qînâ* is first attested in the Mishnah.[24] Finally, it remains unsettled whether the refrain refers to all the fallen Israelites or only to Saul and his son (cf. the refrain in 1 Mc. 9:21, which refers solely to Judas).

We also hear of laments for a king fallen in battle in 2 Ch. 35:25. This verse confirms the tendency (already noted in 2 S. 1:19) of *qînôṯ* to focus on outstanding personalities when they take on written form. It is disputed whether the mention of *qînôṯ* here refers to the book of Lamentations.[25]

VI. Figurative Usage. Except in 2 Ch. 35:25, from the middle of the 8th century on (Am. 5:1-2) the *qînâ* appears only in the context of prophetic oracles of disaster. Even though there are distinctions within this secondary usage,[26] there are shared characteristics: (a) the *qînâ* no longer refers to an event in the past but to a future event, graphically presented by a *qînâ* or a call for a *qînâ* as having already occurred; (b) the subject of the *qînâ* is no longer necessarily a specific person (only in Ezk. 19:1-14; 28:11-19) but a personified national entity; (c) the *qînôṯ* themselves are dominated by the contrastive schema "once — now," which first makes itself heard in 2 S. 1:19-27 (cf. vv. 21-24 with vv. 25-26).

1. *Prophetic qînôṯ.* The earliest instance of figurative usage is Amos's *qînâ* over the northern kingdom, personified as "maiden Israel" (Am. 5:1*-2), legitimated secondarily by the word of God in v. 3 and given concrete application in the face of Assyrian expansion as a prophecy of a military defeat.[27] In the midst of general prosperity and peace with the surrounding nations, Amos shocks his listeners with a lament over a disastrous end that is already an accomplished fact.[28]

The *qînâ* in Ezk. 27:1-36* dates from Nebuchadnezzar's siege of Tyre; it anticipates the total destruction of the city and exhibits two unique features. First, the intrusive introductory messenger formula in v. 3 (cf. 19:1-2 and 32:2) presents the *qînâ* as an oracle of Yahweh, although the rest of the text — in contrast to 28:11-19 — does not in any way presuppose this ascription. We may therefore well ask whether the formula is not a redactional addition to lend the words greater weight. Second, the *qînâ*

---

23. F. Stolz, *ZBK,* 9, 189.
24. Mish. *Mo'ed Qaṭ.* 3:9.
25. This identification is made already by Bab. *B. Bat.* 14b, 15a; and *Ber.* 57b; see also W. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher. HAT* XXI/3 (1955), 9, who assigns v. 25b to a glossator, and most recently J. Bekker, *2 Chronik. NEB,* 124, who assigns the verse to the Chronicler. The identification is rejected by Garr, 60; EÜ, note on 2 Ch. 35:25.
26. See VI.1-3 below.
27. See Fleischer, 2.3.2.
28. On the place of this *qînâ* in Amos's total message, see Fleischer, 6.

incorporates a subsidiary lament (vv. 32-36*), sung by the sea people themselves at the destruction of Tyre. The future-oriented introduction of this latter integrated *qînâ* (*yiqṭōl*-x/*w*ᵉ*qāṭal*-x in vv. 28-32a) makes clear that the *qînâ* in which it is set functions as a prophecy of disaster. Finally, this prophecy itself uses the metaphor of Tyre as a ship, an element found also in 19:1-14 and developed to mythic heights in 28:11-19.

In contrast to Am. 5:1-2 and Ezk. 27, Ezk. 19:1-14; 28:11-19; 32:2-15 address not the nations themselves but their leaders. The *qînâ* over Jehoahaz and Jehoiachin (19:1-14; kernel: vv. 1-9),[29] chanted even before the final destruction of Judah but lamenting it as having already begun with the deportation of the two kings, proved itself in the event all too justified, as the addendum in v. 14b shows.

With reference to the *qînâ* over the king of Tyre in Ezk. 28:11-19, Jahnow rightly speaks of a "disintegrating genre."[30] This disintegration appears both in the restructuring of the *qînâ* as an oracle of Yahweh and in the lack of any similarity to a lament over the death of an individual. In the *qînâ* over Pharaoh in Ezk. 32:1-16, this process of disintegration is even more advanced: an oracle of Yahweh threatening future disaster (note the tense in vv. 3-15) is labeled a *qînâ* by a redactional hand (vv. 2,16) solely on account of the *qînâ* fragment in v. 2; this *qînâ* is to be chanted throughout the world to publish the fate of Egypt.

2. *Imperatives.* Among these prophetic *qînôṯ,* a second category comprises prophetic imperatives calling on the people to take up a *qînâ* (Jer. 7:29, together with a summons to shave the head, a typical mourning ritual) or to summon the mourning women *(m*ᵉ*qôn*ᵉ*nôṯ)* to instruct their daughters in the art of the *qînâ* (Jer. 9:16-17,19-21[17-18,20-22]; interrupted by a *n*ᵉ*hî*); these are addressed to the southern kingdom. It is disputed whether to retain the MT of Jer. 9:9(10) ("I will take up") or to emend it (with LXX) to an imperative summoning the people to take up a *qînâ.*

If the MT is retained,[31] there is no indication that the speaker of v. 9(10) is the prophet. Since v. 10(11) can be spoken only by Yahweh, Schreiner concludes that the abrupt change in speaker indicates different literary units. This conclusion is not necessary, however, since there is also a change of tense and the two verses address different territories (v. 9[10] mountains and steppes, v. 10[11] towns).

3. *Threat.* In Am. 8:10 (redactional) and Ezk. 26:15-18 (postexilic), the change of songs (of joy) into *qînâ* and the taking up of a *qînâ* describe the people's reaction to a forthcoming disaster, signifying its mortal danger.

4. *Ezk. 2:10.* Only in Ezk. 2:10 do we find the masc. pl. *qînîm* (but cf. 2 Ch. 35:25, where the masc. ptcp. *k*ᵉ*ṯuḇîm* modifies *qînôṯ*); it should be understood as a collective (in contrast to individual *qînôṯ*).[32] There is no reason to doubt that actual dirges were

---

29. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1, Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 398.
30. P. 228.
31. J. Schreiner, *Jeremia 1–25. NEB,* 69.
32. Michel, 42.

spread before Ezekiel, leading him to envision the impending disaster he was to proclaim.[33] Here too the *qînâ* has the secondary function of prophesying disaster, in which role it is distinct from both sighing, which is subject to no formal constraints, and the cry of woe.[34]

VII. Metrics. Budde published the fundamental studies of *qînâ* meter, showing that a *qînâ* is characterized by alternation between bicola and tricola.[35] This criterion together with the introductory *'êḵâ* (or *'êḵ,* 2 S. 1:19b; Ezk. 26:17) is used to identify texts not explicitly so designated as *qînôṯ,* especially Lam. 1–5 and Isa. 14:4-21. More ambitious attempts based solely on meter to discover yet more *qînôṯ* succeed only at the price of radical emendation, and should be treated skeptically.[36] Finally, Shea abstracts from the 3:2 schema as a metrical entity and finds in it a structural schema that controls not only the *qînâ* in 2 S. 1:19-27 but also the structure of the entire book of Lamentations.

VIII. Dead Sea Scrolls. The only two occurrences of *qînâ* in the Dead Sea Scrolls diverge from OT usage. This holds true for both the unique construct phrase *kinnôr qînâ* (1QH 11:22) and the construction *nāśā' bᵉqînâ* (1QH 9:4), which is probably not to be interpreted prepositionally[37] but in the sense of the standard construction *nāśā' qînâ;* the preposition is treated as a *bᵉ*-transitivum.[38] Nevertheless, there is a gap in the text that should probably be reconstructed as **נפשׁי**,[39] and the beginning of the clause is not clear; it remains a matter of debate, therefore, whether the subject of the *qînâ* is simply "my soul" or "my soul" together with "Sheol," or even "my bed."[40] The similarity of 1QH 9:4 to Ps. 6:6-7(5-6) supports the theory that the author of the hymn is the subject of the *qînâ.*[41]

Fleischer

---

33. With Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1,* 135; J. W. Wevers, *Ezekiel. NCBC,* 53.
34. See above; → הגה *hāg̱āh.*
35. On the relationship between the two see Garr.
36. See esp. K. Budde, *ZAW* 3 (1883) 299-306; *ZAW* 11 (1891) 234-47; *ZAW* 12 (1892) 31-37, 261-75.
37. Following E. Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran* (Munich, ²1971), 147.
38. JM, §125m; on *nāśā' bᵉ* cf. Job 7:13.
39. M. Delcor, *Les Hymnes de Qumran* (Paris, 1962), 212-13.
40. See, respectively, Lohse; Delcor; J. Maier and K. Schubert, *UTB* 224 (1973), 219, who supply *miṭṭāṯî* instead of *nap̄šî.*
41. Stressed by G. W. Nebe, *RevQ* 12 (1985/87) 118.

קִיץ *qyṣ* → **יקץ** *yqṣ*

קַיִץ *qayiṣ*

I. Etymology. II. Occurrences. III. 1. Season; 2. Fruit; 3. Am. 8:1,2. IV. Sirach and Dead Sea Scrolls. V. LXX.

I. Etymology. The breadth of the experience expressed linguistically by the noun *qayiṣ* is shown by the widespread occurrence of etymological equivalents outside Hebrew. In Aramaic, for example, it appears as *byt kyṣ'*,[1] and as *yrḥ qṣ* in the Gezer Calendar.[2] Other cognates include Can. *qēṣu*, Ugar. *qẓ*,[3] Syr. *qaiṭā*, Christian Palestinian Aram. *qyṭ'*, OSA *qyẓ* or *ḏqṣn*, and Arab. *qaiẓ*.[4]

II. Occurrences. The noun *qayiṣ* occurs 20 times in the OT: Gen. 8:22; 2 S. 16:1,2; Ps. 32:4; 74:17; Prov. 6:8; 10:5; 26:1; 30:25; Isa. 16:9; 28:4; Jer. 8:20; 40:10,12; 48:32; Am. 3:15; 8:1,2; Mic. 7:1; Zec. 14:8.

III. 1. *Season.* Gen. 8:22; Ps. 74:17; Am. 3:15; and Zec. 14:8 speak of *qayiṣ* in combination with → חרף *ḥōrep*. The combination makes clear that in these texts *qayiṣ* is to be understood as the name of a season; as the juxtaposition of *ḥōm* and *qayiṣ* shows, *qayiṣ* refers to the hot, rainless season or summer. Thus it also refers to the time of harvest. Dalman speaks of transition periods between summer and winter, which might suggest four seasons;[5] but these transition periods are not full-fledged seasons, and Israel really thinks in terms of two seasons. Thus *qayiṣ* and *ḥōrep* together constitute an inclusive term comprehending the entire year, but extending beyond any particular year and thus serving as a periphrastic expression for "always," "at all times" (at least in Ps. 74:17; Zec. 14:8).

While Ps. 74:17 extols Yahweh's creative power in the context of a hymnic passage, Zec. 14:8 expresses the eschatological expectation that in winter and summer living water will flow out from Jerusalem; it envisions elimination of all climatic distinction between summer and winter, just as there will be no alternation of night and day, cold and heat (vv. 6-7). Thus Zec. 14:6ff. is an antithetical counterpart to Gen. 8:22, which promises ceaseless alternation of night and day, summer and winter, cold and heat, to sustain the created order.

---

qayiṣ. G. Dalman, *AuS*, I/1, 34-50; H. Klein, "Das Klima Palästinas auf Grund der alten hebräischen Quellen," *ZDPV* 37 (1914) 217-49, 297-327, esp. 222-26; J. Nelis, "Jahreszeiten," *BL*³, 793-94; W. Rordorf, "Jahreszeiten," *BHHW*, II, 795; K. A. D. Smelik, *Writings from Ancient Israel* (Eng. trans. Louisville, 1991).

1. *DISO*, 262.
2. *KAI*, 182.I.7; *TUAT*, I/3, 247-48; Smelik, 25-27.
3. *UT*, no. 2224; *KTU*, 1.20, 5; 1.24, 24; 1.19, I, 41.
4. *HAL*, III, 1098.
5. P. 50.

Am. 3:15 refers to an upper-class luxury, qualified by *qayiṣ* as being limited to a particular season — probably a second house for use in the summer in addition to a winter house.[6]

The book of Proverbs in particular connects summer with harvest.[7] For example, 6:6ff. calls the attention of the lazy to the ant, which prepares its food in the summer, collecting sustenance during the harvest. The parallelism shows that *qayiṣ* and *qāṣîr* are related or even synonymous. This direct parallelism appears again in 10:5, which deals with industriousness vs. laziness during the harvest. It appears also in 26:1, which dismisses the possibility of honoring a fool by using paradoxical images such as snow in summer or rain in harvest. Using the same temporal parallelism, Jer. 8:20 laments that the harvest is past, the summer is ended, but no help is at hand. The industry of the ant reappears in the setting of a numerical proverb in Prov. 30:25, although this text does not mention *qāṣîr.*

The identification of summer with harvest reappears in Isa. 16:9 and Jer. 48:32, similar verses each in the context of a lament over Moab. (In Jer. 48:32 we should probably read *qāṣîr* instead of *bāṣîr,* after the analogy of Isa. 16:9.) The two passages share the thought that the harvest will fail in Moab because the enemy has overrun the land; enemy shouts of triumph replace Moabite rejoicing over the harvest.

The usage in Ps. 32:4 is more figurative: the heat of fever is likened to the heat of summer.

2. *Fruit.* The remaining texts refer to the produce of summer, building on the foundation laid by the texts discussed in the previous section. This meaning of *qayiṣ* is clearly present in 2 S. 16:1,2, where the noun appears in a list of foodstuffs. The combination with wine (and oil) in Jer. 40:10,12 against the background of summer suggests that *qayiṣ* may refer to figs. It is here a symbol of new hope, since a bountiful new harvest is predicted. We find *qayiṣ* with more negative overtones in Isa. 28:4 and Mic. 7:1. According to Isa. 28:4, the fruit will be devoured as soon as it appears, and a similar fate — destruction — will befall Samaria. Mic. 7:1ff. laments the corruption of the people; the faithful have vanished from the land like fruit from the field after harvest.

3. *Am. 8:1,2.* The meaning of *qayiṣ* is disputed in the vision reported in Am. 8:1,2, where the noun appears in the immediate company of *qēṣ*. The question is: are we dealing here with a play on words, or is the differentiation of the two words a late phenomenon, *qayiṣ* and *qēṣ* being interchangeable orthographic variants, so that originally only the meaning of *qayiṣ* was relevant? In the latter case, the reading of *qēṣ* as "end" would be a secondary apocalyptic interpretation.[8] There is no evidence, however, to support this theory: all the texts in which the season or its harvest plays a role use the triliteral form; apart from Am. 8:2 there is no reason to understand the biliteral form in

6. *KAI,* 216.18-19; see also H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1977), 202.
7. → קצר *qṣr.*
8. K. Koch et al., *Amos. AOAT* 30/2 (1976), 51.

the sense of *qayiṣ*. But it remains an open question whether *qayiṣ* should be understood here as the season (= time of harvest) or as fruit (figs). The latter would mean that Amos sees a basket full of recently harvested figs and concludes that his people are ripe for the harvest (judgment). If the emphasis is more on the season, *qayiṣ* should be translated "(empty) harvest basket": "The harvest is at hand, Yahweh is beginning to harvest the fruit, his empty basket ready to hand."[9] This interpretation is conceivable because the close association of *qayiṣ* and *qāṣîr* suggests identification of the two terms,[10] even though when used by itself in the harvest context *qayiṣ* refers to fruit.

IV. Sirach and Dead Sea Scrolls. The text of Sir. 40:7 is not clear, since the Hebrew version is extant only in fragments.[11] In Sir. 50:8, however, the reference to the season is clear.

In the Dead Sea Scrolls 1QS 10:7 mentions *qayiṣ* in the context of a list of seasons, again in combination with *qāṣîr.* All the other occurrences of *qayiṣ* refer to time in general: 4Q491 23:2; 499 10:2; 502 9:3; 508 3:4; 509 1:5; 5-6, II, 2; 205:2 (text unclear); 510 1:6,7,8; 511 1:3; 3:3; 10:3,4,5; 35:6,8; 111:4. The interpretation of *qayiṣ* in 518 31:1 remains open.

V. LXX. The LXX offers a wide range of translations. When the season is involved, the most common translation is *théros.* We also find *ámētos, therinós, therismós, opṓra,* and *kaúma.*

Hausmann

---

9. M. Weippert, in M. Weippert, H. Weippert, and K. Seybold, *Beiträge zur prophetischen Bildsprache in Israel und Assyrien. OBO* 64 (1985), 24.
10. See III.1 above.
11. G. Sauer, *JSHRZ* III/5, 603 n. 7.

קִיר *qîr*

I. Etymology and Meaning. II. Occurrences: 1. General; 2. Toponyms. III. 1. Usage; 2. *maštîn* *b^{e}qîr.* IV. Versions; Dead Sea Scrolls.

---

qîr. H. J. Dreyer, "The Roots *qr,* ʿ*r,* *ġr,* and *ṣ/ṭr* = 'Stone, Wall, City' etc.," *De fructu oris sui. FS A. van Selms. POS* 9 (1971), 17-25; S. Krauss, "Städtenamen und Bauwesen," *ZAW* 28 (1908) 241-70, esp. 267ff.; E. Nestle, "Miscellen," *ZAW* 21 (1901) 327-36, esp. 327ff.; H. Weippert, "Mauer und Mauertechnik," *BRL*^{2}, 209-12; F. Zimmermann, "עִיר, קִיר and Related Forms," *75th Anniversary Volume of JQR* (1967), 582-92; → חומה *ḥômâ.*

I. Etymology and Meaning. The noun *qîr* is treated as a biliteral noun with a long medial vowel.[1] Only in Isa. 22:5 is it written defectively in Hebrew. Such texts as Ps. 62:4(Eng. 3) show that the word is masculine in Hebrew.[2] In Phoenician we find *qr;*[3] the same form occurs in Moabite (Mesha Stone).[4] In Biblical Hebrew and Phoenician, it almost always refers to a "wall," whereas in Moabite it refers to a "city" (cf. the Hebrew toponyms with *qîr*[5]). In Middle Hebrew *qîr* often means "fringe" or "edge."[6]

There is also a Jewish Aramaic word *qîrā'* meaning "wax" or "asphalt";[7] the same word appears in Syriac and Mandaic.[8] Akk. *qīru*[9] means "hot bitumen," "asphalt"; it is also written *kīru(m).*[10] According to von Soden, this latter word is a Sumerian loanword borrowed by Hebrew and Aramaic (cf. *kūru,* "smelting furnace," and *kīru,* "kiln"[11]); Haupt connects *qîr* with Akk. *kāru(m),* "quay," "embankment," and suggests that Heb. *qîr* originally meant "built with bitumen."[12] We also find Arab. *qār* or *qîr* with the meaning "tar, pitch," and the verb *qīr* II, "coat with pitch."[13] Gk. *kērós* and Lat. *cera,* "wax," may be related.

Whether Heb. *qîr* and Aram. *qîrā'* are related is unclear. The connection is affirmed by *KBL*[1,2] but labeled uncertain by *KBL*[3]*/HAL.* According to *KBL*[1,2],[14] *qîr* originally referred to the plaster of a wall made of wattle or clay bricks, in contrast to *gāḏēr,* which meant a wall made of stones. But already Gesenius considered the etymology of the word uncertain, although he conjectured that under the influence of *qûr,* "dig," the noun *qîr,* "embankment," might have developed the meaning "wall."[15] Dreyer is of the opinion that the root *qr,* which gave rise to *qîr* as well as *qereṯ,* "city,"[16] *qartā',* and Ugar. *qrt,* is connected with the roots *'r, ǵr, ṣr,* and *ṯr,* all of which developed out of a Proto-Semitic root with the meaning "stone," "dress stone." The initial radical of this root was variable; the second was invariably /*r*/. Zimmermann, too, believes that *qîr* and *'îr* are simply dialectal variants. He also considers *qûr* a vocalic variant of *qîr,*

On III.2: M. Bič, *"Maštîn bᵉqîr,"* *VT* 4 (1954) 411-16; S. Ivry, "המים בישראל ובמזרח קדום קללת זיהום," *BethM* 28 (1982/83) 322-25, 407-8; S. Talmon and W. W. Fields, "משתין בקיר ועצור ועזוב and Its Meaning," *ZAW* 101 (1989) 85-112.

1. *BLe,* §61p; cf. *HAL,* III, 1099: a primary noun.
2. K. Albrecht, *ZAW* 16 (1896) 85; also for the fem. form in Ezk. 13:14.
3. *KAI,* 7.1; 43.13; Tomback, 292.
4. *KAI,* 181.11,12,24,29; cf. *DISO,* 263.
5. See II.2 below.
6. *WTM,* IV, 302.
7. *ChW,* 360.
8. *LexSyr,* 665; *MdD,* 412.
9. *AHw,* II, 923a; *CAD,* Q, 270-71.
10. *AHw,* I, 484-85.
11. See, respectively, *AHw,* I, 512; *CAD,* K, 415-16.
12. P. Haupt, *JAOS* 28 (1907) 104.
13. Wehr, 804.
14. P. 838.
15. *GesTh,* 1210.
16. → קריה *qiryâ.*

whose vowel is short. Just as *'îr* derives from *'rr,* so *qîr* derives from the root *qrr.* In this connection he cites Arab. *qarra,* "inhabit," etc. On the other hand, Segert considers Moab. *qr,* "city," a dialectal variant of Heb. *qîr,* "wall," so one need not posit a relationship between /ʿ/ and /q/ analogous to Aramaic.[17] It is hard to prove that *qîr* and → קִרְיָה *qiryâ* are associated etymologically with a biliteral root *qr.*[18] Of course *KBL³/HAL* is correct in pointing out that the connection between Heb. and Moab. *qîr,* "wall," and Aram. *qîrā',* "asphalt," is itself not assured.

II. Occurrences.

1. *General.* Apart from toponyms, the noun *qîr* (once written defectively: *qir*) occurs 74 times in the OT: 10 times in the Pentateuch, 25 times in the Dtr History, 32 times in the prophetic books, and 7 times in the Writings (6 times in the Chronicler's History plus Ps. 62:4[3]). The word also occurs twice in Sirach (14:24; 50:2).

2. *Toponyms.* The noun *qîr* appears in two city names, *qîr mô'āḇ* (Isa. 15:1) and *qîr ḥereś* (Jer. 48:31,36), also written *qîr ḥāreś* (Isa. 16:11), *qîr ḥᵉreśeṯ* (Isa. 16:7), or *qîr ḥᵃrāśeṯ* (2 K. 3:25). In addition, we also find *qîr* alone as the name of a land or city (2 K. 16:9; Isa. 22:6; Am. 1:5; 9:7).

In the case of *qîr mô'āḇ* and *qîr ḥereś* (with variants), we are probably dealing with a Moabite city traditionally identified (on the basis of Tg.) with Kerak, on the upper course of the Wadi el-Kerak, east of the Dead Sea.[19] Some scholars suggest that *qîr ḥereś* and its variants should be considered a derisive variant (or a colloquialism?[20]) for *qîr ḥāḏašt,* "Newtown" (cf. Carthage = *qrtḥdšt*),[21] especially since the LXX reads *Keirádas* in Jer. 48:31,36 (= LXX 31:31,36).[22] We see from 2 K. 3:25 that the city was an almost impregnable fortress, a good description of Kerak.[23]

Am. 9:7 and 1:5 speak of *qîr* as the land from which the Arameans came and to which they shall be sent in exile. In 2 K. 16:9 we read that the king of Assyria, Tiglath-pileser III, exiled the inhabitants of Damascus to Kir. Isa. 22:6 mentions Kir in conjunction with Elam. In 2 K. 16:9 Gray thinks that "Kir" means "the city" par excellence: Assyria.[24] He finds no connection with Am. 9:7, where be believes *qîr* is a scribal error for *qᵉrāqîr* (cf. Arab. "water holes"); this theory is unlikely.[25] Equally uncertain is the view of Haupt that Kir is only the secondary name of a city, namely Ur

17. *ArOr* 29 (1961) 243-44. A similar position is taken by A. H. van Zyl, *The Moabites. POS* 3 (1960), 175; F. S. Frick, *The City in Ancient Israel. SBLDS* 36 (Missoula, 1977), 42.

18. See also T. Nöldeke, *Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft* (Strasbourg, 1904), 62 with n. 1; *VG,* I, 194.

19. *GTTOT,* §§170, 1246-47; van Zyl, *Moabites,* 69ff.

20. *HAL,* III, 1100; but cf. Krauss, 267-68.

21. Already proposed by G. C. Workman, *The Text of Jeremiah* (1889), 382; see also Van Zyl; Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1997), 146-47.

22. Nestle.

23. F.-M. Abel, *Géographie de la Palestine,* II (Paris, 1967), 418-19.

24. *I & II Kings. OTL* (²1970), 633.

25. Cf. *HAL,* III, 1100.

in Chaldea.[26] Kir might well have been located somewhere in southern Babylonia, in the vicinity of Elam.[27]

III. 1. *Usage.* In most OT passages *qîr* means an interior or exterior wall of a house, a building, or some small structure, in contrast to → חוֹמָה *ḥômâ,* which usually means a city wall. The distinction is clear in Josh. 2:15: because Rahab's house abutted the face of the city wall *(b^eqîr haḥômâ),* she lived by the city wall *(baḥômâ).* In 2 K. 4:10 the reference is probably to a (small) upper room abutting the wall of the house. In Nu. 35:4 *qîr* appears to be almost identical with the city wall: the pastureland of the Levites, a thousand cubits wide, extended around (the outside of) the city wall. The word *qîr* can also denote a face or side of a smaller structure such as the incense altar (Ex. 30:3) or the main altar (Lev. 1:15; 5:9).

Walls were often daubed with whitewash (Ezk. 13:12-15),[28] but David wanted to overlay the walls of the temple with gold and silver (1 Ch. 29:4). In early periods, walls were usually made of rough quarry stones; later they were made of smooth ashlar. The stonemasons who helped build the palace and temple of David and Solomon came from Phoenicia (2 S. 5:11 par. 1 Ch. 14:1), although archeologists have discovered quarries in Palestine near the sites where the stones were used.[29] The texts describing the building of Solomon's temple (1 K. 6) and the projected temple of Ezekiel (Ezk. 41) frequently mention the walls of the temple, although especially in 1 K. 6 the task of textual criticism in deciding between *qîrôṯ,* "walls," and *qôrôṯ,* "beams," is not always easy (see vv. 15b and 16).[30]

Nu. 22:24 speaks of a path between vineyards with a fence *(gāḏēr)* on either side. The following verse calls the fence a *qîr,* clearly referring to the lateral wall of an enclosure. Hyssop can grow in such a wall (1 K. 5:13[4:33]),[31] and a snake can even hide between the stones of a wall (Am. 5:19). In a house or other building, one can sit "by the wall" (1 S. 20:25) or try to pin someone "to the wall" in anger (1 S. 18:11; 19:10). One who is out of sorts, angry, or despondent can turn his or her face to the wall (2 K. 20:2; cf. 1 K. 21:4). It is possible to dig through a wall (Ezk. 8:7-10; 12:5-12) or fasten an image or a painting to the wall (23:14). An iron plate can be used as an iron wall, a solid dividing wall (4:3; cf. 43:8: only a wall separates the temple from the palace). A wall of a house can be infected with reddish or greenish spots (Lev. 14:37,39), in which case the law concerning leprosy in houses applies. A downpour, hail, or a windstorm can cause a wall to collapse (Ezk. 13:11-12), and whitewash will offer no protection.[32] The expression *qîr nāṭûy* (Ps. 62:4[3]) — alongside *gāḏēr hadd^eḥûyâ* —

26. P. Haupt, *JBL* 36 (1917) 93-99.
27. Šanda, *EHAT* IX/2, 199; *GTTOT,* §19; Wildberger, 365.
28. Weippert.
29. Weippert, 210.
30. See also Mulder, *I Koningen. COT,* 211-12.
31. Mulder, *ZAW* 94 (1982) 411.
32. → IV, 269.

probably means an "overhanging wall,"[33] a wall that is leaning because of a poor foundation, inferior construction, or an earthquake.[34]

Other examples of this general usage could be cited, such as "groping like the blind along a wall" (Isa. 59:10) or "talking about someone by the wall" (Ezk. 33:30). But there are other expressions in which the meaning of *qîr* is metaphorical or obscure.

In Isa. 22:5 the alliterative and assonant expression *m*ᵉ*qarqar qir* is often translated "the wall collapses" or the like. The proposal to emend *qir* (only here written defectively) to the gentilic name *qôaʿ*, equivalent to cuneiform *qutu*, has not found acceptance.[35] Citing Ugar. *qr*, "noise," and seeing here an onomatopoetic reduplicating intensive of *qr*, Weippert has proposed the translation: "In the valley of vision there was tumult — tumult and a cry to the mountains."[36]

Equally disputed is the translation "wall" in Isa. 25:4. God is the refuge of the poor and the needy in their distress, a shelter from the storm and a shade from the heat, for the blast of the ruthless is like *zerem qîr*. Then v. 5 continues: ". . . like heat in a dry land." Many emend *qîr* to *qōr*, "cold," reading "rain in winter" instead of "heat in a dry land."[37] But the translation "a shower of rain against the wall" (MT and some earlier exegetes) should not be ruled out, especially since vv. 4c and 5a may be a gloss.[38]

In Jer. 4:19 the pl. *qîrôṯ libbî*, "walls of my heart," refers metaphorically to the violent beating of the prophet's heart when he is emotionally aroused (cf. LXX *aisthētēria*).[39] In Ezk. 13:10-15 the prophet metaphorically illustrates his attack on the false prophets with the image of an interior wall (*ḥayiṣ*; only here in the OT[40]) made of loose stones, built by the people and smeared with the whitewash of the false prophets' words. When the day of Yahweh's judgment comes, the people will see that the cracks were simply whitewashed over.

2. *maštîn b*ᵉ*qîr*. The idiom *maštîn b*ᵉ*qîr*, which occurs several times, has a specialized meaning. It appears in the context of David's threat against Nabal (1 S. 25:22,34) and the threat against or extermination of Jeroboam (1 K. 14:10), Baasha (1 K. 16:11), and Ahab (1 K. 21:21; 2 K. 9:8). In these texts it appears three times in conjunction with the expression *ʿāṣûr w*ᵉ*ʿāzûḇ*.[41] Even though the latter is a truly "enigmatic expression"[42] of uncertain meaning ("bound/released," "minor/adult," "slave/free," "pure/impure"), there is consensus with respect to the meaning of *maštîn b*ᵉ*qîr*: "one who urinates

33. *HAL*, III, 1099.
34. *AuS*, VII, 64.
35. Klostermann, *GesB*, etc.
36. M. Weippert, *ZAW* 73 (1961) 97ff. Weippert's suggestion has been accepted by Wildberger, 350; C. J. Labuschagne, *THAT*, II, 666, expresses reservations.
37. E.g., J. B. Peters, *JBL* 11 (1892) 46; *GesB*; *KBL*²; *HAL*; cf. *BHS*; Wildberger, 516.
38. See E. König, *Historisch-comparative Syntax der hebräischen Sprache* (Leipzig, 1897), §336t.
39. W. Rudolph, *Jeremia*, *HAT* XII (³1968), 36; McKane, *Jeremiah*. *ICC*, 1:102-3.
40. *HAL*, I, 312.
41. E. Kutsch, *VT* 2 (1952) 60.
42. → X, 588.

against the wall," i.e., either "male" or "dog."[43] Kutsch even believes that "the group denoted by עָצוּר וְעָזוּב . . . is also defined by מַשְׁתִּין בְּקִיר."[44] Analyzing 1 S. 25, however, Bič has shown that the idiom is a "degraded play on words," which in fact refers to those qualified to participate in the Canaanite cult, who were looked upon in Yahwistic circles as "spiritually impure people."[45] Ivry has questioned whether this idiom should even be considered a picturesque symbol of maleness, proposing instead, on the basis of Ugar. *qr,* to interpret it as referring to a "well (of impure water)." In this expression, he argues, *qîr* does not mean "wall" but "spring" or "well"; and the idiom expresses condemnation of those who pollute a source of drinking water (e.g., by urinating in it). In any case, he argues, the expression does not simply refer to males or dogs.

IV. Versions; Dead Sea Scrolls. The LXX generally translates *qîr* with *toíchos* (some 60 times); *teíchos,* the usual translation of *ḥômâ,* appears only 4 times (Nu. 35:4; Isa. 15:1; 16:11; Ezk. 33:30). The Vg. usually translates *qîr* with *paries,* Tg. with *kuṯlā',* and Syr. with *'eštā'.*

In 1QH 3:13 we read of "foundations of the wall" *('ûššê qîr)* that "shake like a ship on the surface of the sea," and in 1QH 7:9 of "my walls, that have become a tested bulwark" *(qîrôṯay lᵉḥômaṯ bōḥan).*

In the Temple Scroll *qîr* appears almost 20 times; it refers exclusively to the wall of the temple (11QT 30:7; 38:14; etc.). The regulations governing walls infected with leprosy are also incorporated (49:12). In the liturgies for the Sabbath sacrifice, *qîrôṯ* refers to the walls of the heavenly sanctuary (4Q403 1:43-44; 11QShirShab 5-6:5; cf. 1 En. 14:12,15).

Mulder

43. For the first see *AuS,* VII, 81. The last two meanings are already noted by Bab. *B. Bat.* 19a and Kimchi.

44. Kutsch, *VT* 2 (1952) 61. See also P. P. Saydon, *VT* 2 (1952) 373.

45. Pp. 412, 416.

קלה *qlh* II; קָלוֹן *qālôn*

I. 1. Distribution; 2. Etymology; 3. LXX; 4. Meaning. II. 1. Verb; 2. Noun; 3. Summary. III. Dead Sea Scrolls.

qlh. G. J. Botterweck, *Der Triliteralismus im Semitischen. BBB* 3 (1952), esp. 40-44, 62; C. A. Keller, "קלל *qll* leicht sein," *THAT,* II, 641-47; W. W. Müller, "Altsüdarabische Beiträge zum hebräischen Lexikon," *ZAW* 75 (1963) 304-16, esp. 314.

I. 1. *Distribution.* The OT occurrences of the root *qlh* II[1] (distinct from *qālâ* I, "roast") and its nominal derivative *qālôn* are distributed as follows: almost all the 14 or 15 occurrences of the verb (2 in Deuteronomy; once each in Samuel, Psalms [possibly], and Proverbs; 7 [ms. B: 8] in Sirach; 2 in Isaiah) are in the niphal; there are two exceptions (Dt. 27:16; Sir. 10:29, hiphil). There are 21 occurrences of the noun *qālôn* (once in Psalms, once in Job, 8 in Proverbs, 4 in Sirach, once in Isaiah, 2 in Jeremiah, 2 in Hosea, once in Nahum, once in Habakkuk). We see that more than half of the occurrences are in wisdom texts.

2. *Etymology.* Scholars generally consider the verb *qlh* II a by-form of → קלל *qll*, "be light, small, insignificant."[2] Bergsträsser cites it as an example of those instances in which two identical strong consonants develop synonymous weak forms.[3]

Extrabiblical (postbiblical) instances of *qlh* include Jewish Aram. *ql'*, "become contemptible," Syr. *qᵉlā'* (pael and aphel), "contemn," and Tigr. *qālā*, "be proud, proudly disdain"; cf. also Arab. *qalā* and *qaliya*, "hate, abominate," and OSA *qly*, "disgrace."[4] On the noun *qālôn*, cf. Jewish Aram. *qᵉlānā'*, "ignominy, disgrace," and Syr. *qᵉlāytā'*, "contempt, slander."

3. *LXX.* The LXX usually translates the verb with *atimázō/atimía/átimos;* exceptions are Dt. 25:3 *(aschēnomeín),* 1 S. 18:23 *(ouchí éndoxos),* Sir. 10:31 *(ádoxos),* and Sir. 25:8 *(anáxios).* For the noun *qālôn* we almost always find *atimía/atimázō,* except in Sir. 6:1 *(aischýnē),* Jer. 46:12 (LXX 26:12, *phōnē!*). There is no equivalent in Sir. 34(31):29.

4. *Meaning.* Because *qlh* II is a by-form of *qll,* we would expect it to share the latter's nuances,[5] i.e., "be(come) or be considered light, contemptible" (niphal) and "make contemptible" (hiphil). The subst. *qālôn* denotes the result, i.e., "contempt, disgrace."[6] The LXX translation points in the same directions. Analysis of the context, synonyms, and antonyms involved in specific passages will lend additional precision.

II. 1. *Verb.* Of the occurrences of the verb in the niphal, only three use the finite verb to express the action or perception of a reduction in public reputation or esteem. Dt. 25:3 urges moderation in corporal punishment, "lest if more lashes are given your brother be degraded in your sight *(wᵉniqlâ 'āḥîḵā lᵉ'ênêḵā).*" A person's dignity must not be degraded in the eyes of his brother by excess in administering corporal punishment. In Isa. 16:14 an apocalyptic addition to an oracle against Moab declares: "In

---

1. *HAL,* III, 1101; *GesB,* 714.
2. *HAL,* III, 1101; *GesB,* 714; Keller, 643.
3. *Hebräische Grammatik* (2 vols.; Leipzig, 1918-29), II, §31c. See also Botterweck, 67-69, whose compilation of meanings associated with *ḳl (ql)* (42-44) probably goes too far, however, as Keller (642) correctly observes.
4. Müller, 314.
5. Keller, 643.
6. *HAL,* III, 1101-2; *GesB,* 714.

three years, like the years of a hired worker, the glory of Moab will be brought into contempt *(wᵉniqlâ kᵉḇôḏ mô'āḇ),* with great tumult." Judgment will bring disrespect and contempt for the *kāḇôḏ* and *hāmôn* of a land or people — down to a tiny remnant (v. 14b). In a discussion of true and false honor, Sir. 11:6 speaks of God's providential works (v. 4) that reverse social status: oppressed unknowns accede to the throne (v. 5), and "many rulers *(nś'ym)* have been utterly disgraced *(nqlw m'd)* and the honored *(nkbdym)* have been handed over to the lowly" (ms. B). In other words, the niphal participles expressing high status and respect are antonyms to the niphal of *qlh.*

The niphal participle of *qlh* II always expresses low status and repute, both social and moral. In 1 S. 18:23b, for example, David initially responds evasively to Michal's offer made through Saul: "Does it seem to you a little thing *(nᵉqallâ)* to become the king's son-in-law? I am a poor man and of no repute *('îš-rāš wᵉniqleh).*" In contrast to the status and wealth of King Saul, David points out his own humble social status. As a manifestation of God's judgment, Isa. 3:5 prophesies mutual oppression within the nation (v. 5a) and perversion of the social order (v. 5b): "The youth will be insolent to the elder and the base to the honorable *(wᵉhanniqleh bannikbāḏ).*" Here the participle may go beyond the aspect of low social status, referring to the morally despicable individual who can rise in a state of anarchy.[7] Prov. 12:9 addresses the situation of an individual of modest social status but substantial means (ownership of a slave, *niqleh wᵉ'eḇeḏ lô*) — in contrast to the self-important one *(mtkbd)* who has no food.[8] In Sir. 10:19 fear of God vs. transgression of the law gives marked ethical and religious overtones to the contrast between *nikbāḏ* and *niqleh:* "Whose offspring are worthy of honor? Human offspring. Whose offspring are worthy of honor? Those who fear the Lord. Whose offspring are unworthy of honor *(nqlh)*? Human offspring. Whose offspring are unworthy of honor *(nqlh)*? Those who break the commandments."[9] Likewise 10:31 presupposes a criterion for (dis)honor that transcends wealth or poverty: "One who is honored *(nkbd)* in poverty, how much more in wealth! And one dishonored *(nqlh)* in wealth, how much more in poverty!"[10] Following a macarism of the man who lives with a sensible wife, 25:8d goes on to macarize the one who has not served a *nqlh,* an inferior in status and respect.

In the context of a penitential psalm of a sick individual,[11] Ps. 38:8(7) reads *kᵉsālay mālᵉ'û niqleh;* most scholars derive the niphal from *qlh* I: "My loins are filled with burning."[12] Others, however,[13] follow the LXX *(empaigmōn),* Vg. *(illusionibus),* and

7. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1991), 132.

8. O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos. BK* XVII (1983), 145, 149; W. McKane, *Proverbs. OTL* (1970), 229, 444.

9. NRSV, following G. Sauer, *JSHRZ* III/5, 530; P. Skehan and A. Di Lella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira. AB* 39 (1987), 227, using LXX for the positive statements and ms. B for the negative.

10. NRSV, following LXX and Syr. with Sauer, *JSHRZ* III/5, 531; Skehan and Di Lella, *Ben Sira,* 228. The Hebrew text of mss. A and B has been amplified.

11. K. Seybold, *Das Gebet des Kranken im AT. BWANT* 99 (1973), 101-2, 105-6.

12. HAL, III, 1101; most recently such exegetes as H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Minneapolis, 1988), 409, and G. Ravasi, *Il libro dei Salmi,* I (1981), 691.

13. Even-Shoshan, 897; C. A. and E. G. Briggs, *Psalms I. ICC,* 342; cf. G. R. Castellino, *Libro dei Salmi* (Turin, 1965), 117, 866.

Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos (ignominia) in deriving the form from *qlh* II. Calvin's translation of *nqlh* as *foeditas* ("repulsive sores") would appear well worth considering.[14]

The hiphil participle appears twice. In Dt. 27:16 *'ārûr maqleh 'āḇîw wᵉ'immô* (in a decalogue of curses) refers to those who treat their parents with contempt (cf. Sir. 3:10, *qlwn;* Ex. 21:17; Lev. 20:9, *qll* piel). Sir. 10:29 cautions against false contempt for oneself: "Who will acquit those who condemn themselves? And who will honor those who dishonor *(maqleh)* themselves?" The synonym *mršyʿ* suggests unjustified ethical self-abasement (antonyms: *hṣdyq, kbd*).

2. *Noun.* The noun *qālôn* occurs 21 times, 7 times as subject. Prov. 11:2 ("When pride [*zāḏôn*] comes, then comes disgrace [*qālôn*], but wisdom is with the humble") uses paronomasia and rhyme in v. 2aα-β to show how the seeds of contempt and dishonor are already present in haughty behavior, in contrast to the honor that is the fruit of wisdom. Citing poverty and disgrace *(rēš wᵉqālôn)* as the punishment incurred by those who ignore instruction, 13:18 emphasizes the social dimension even more, as does the promise of honor *(yᵉḵubbāḏ)* for those who heed reproof. In 22:10 *qālôn* (defamation) is the consequence of quarreling *(dîn)* and abuse *(māḏôn),* which cease when the scoffer is driven out. In Isa. 22:18 the prophet threatens the arrogant steward Shebna with judgment and death in a distant land, angrily calling him "you disgrace *(qālôn)* to your master's house." In other words, his arrogant conduct disgraces the king. In Jer. 13:26 Yahweh threatens Jerusalem, which has forgotten him: "I myself will lift up your skirts over your face, and your shame *(qᵉlônēḵ)* will be seen" — an outwardly visible act of defilement (destruction) that reveals the inward self-denudation and self-defilement of the city through idolatry as adultery (cf. v. 27 and Nah. 3:5). Sir. 5:13 points out the ambivalent power of a speaker, in whose hand (power) lie *kāḇôḏ wᵉqālôn,* public honor and dishonor; v. 13b equates the latter with the destruction wrought by the human tongue. Sir. 31:28(34:28) describes the positive triad of gladness, delight, and pleasure that result from wine drunk in moderation; v. 29 contrasts these with the negative triad of headache, bitterness, and dishonor *(qālôn): qālôn* adds to bodily discomfort the dimension of public disgrace.

Most frequently (11 times), *qālôn* appears as an object. Hos. 4:18 summarizes Israel's obduracy: "They indulge in fornication upon fornication, they love and love *qālôn māḡinneyhā.*" There is almost no end to the possibilities raised by this obscure phrase. For example, Andersen and Freedman link it with v. 19: "He [Yahweh] constrains Ignominy with its shields, her lustful spirit . . . with its wings"; they interpret *qālôn* as an idol.[15] With G. R. Driver, Wolff interprets *māḡēn* as "shameless": "They (even love) the dishonor (of the) shameless."[16] Noting LXX *ek phryágmatos,* Rudolph translates: "Dishonor is the recompense for it."[17] Horst and Robinson propose: "More

14. *In Librum Psalmorum Commentarius* (1836), 298.
15. F. I. Andersen and D. N. Freedman, *Hosea. AB* 24 (1980), 344, 379; → VIII, 82.
16. H. W. Wolff, *Hosea. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1974), 730.
17. W. Rudolph, *Hosea. KAT* XIII/1 (1966), 106, 108.

than their pride *(migg^e'ōnîm)* they love dishonor."[18] In context, however, accepting the MT without emendation appears to be the simplest solution: "Loving, their princes love dishonor."[19] The idolatry of the authorities results in *qālôn.*

Hab. 2:16 threatens dishonor on the king of Babylon, who has made his neighbor drink the cup of wrath to gaze on his nakedness: "You yourself shall drink your fill of dishonor, not honor *(śāba'tā qālôn mikkābôd).*"[20] In a prayer for God to come to judgment in a theophanic storm, Ps. 83:17(16) pleads that the enemies of the people will be ignominiously disgraced: "Fill their faces with shame *(mallē'... qālôn),* that Yahweh's name may be sought and known" (cf. vv. 18-19[17-18]). The final words of Job 10:15 are hard to analyze: "Sated with disgrace and steeped in affliction" *(ś^eba' qālôn ûr^e'ēh [r^ewēh?] 'onyî).*[21] Here *qālôn* is not a punishment (as in Hab. 2:15) but the disgrace of the innocent sufferer, parallel with affliction.

In Proverbs *qālôn* is the consequence of a fool's actions. Prov. 3:35 presents *kābôd* and *qālôn* as the extreme, polar results of wisdom and folly, however the verb *mērîm* in v. 35b is understood. Following LXX and Vg., some interpret the verb as the hiphil singular ptcp. of *rûm* ("he [Yahweh] enhances their disgrace") or emend to plural *(m^erîmîm:* "fools enhance their disgrace").[22] Others read the hiphil ptcp. of *mwr:* "but fools exchange disgrace."[23] According to 6:33, adulterers find wounds and dishonor *(nega' w^eqālôn),* which will not be wiped away. In 9:7 *qālôn* ("humiliation," the disgrace of failure) and *mûm* ("scolding") are the reward that scoffers and the wicked give those who try to correct them. According to 12:16, fools reveal themselves by venting their anger *(ka'as),* the prudent *('ārûm)* by ignoring insults *(qālôn).*

Jer. 46:12 is set in an oracle against Egypt, declaring its agony incurable after its defeat at Carchemish (v. 11); here *qālôn* is Egypt's shame broadcast by the news: "The nations hear of your shame *(q^elônēk),* and your cry of woe *(ṣiwḥātēk)* fills the earth." Echoing the prophecy against Jerusalem in Jer. 13:26, Nah. 3:5 has Yahweh proclaim vengeance upon Nineveh for its bloody seduction of the nations: "and I will let nations look on your nakedness *(ma'ar)* and kingdoms on your shame *(qālôn).*" This shameful display of Nineveh's nakedness reveals both her crime (diplomatic intrigue as prostitution; cf. v. 4) and her punishment (destruction). According to Sir. 6:1 ("A bad name incurs shame and reproach"),[24] *qālôn* and a bad name *(šēm ra')* go hand in hand.

In three texts *qālôn* is the object of a preposition. In Hos. 4:7 God threatens to forget the sons of the priests who have forgotten the law; furthermore, God declares, "the more they increased, the more they sinned against me; I shall change their glory into

---

18. F. Horst and T. H. Robinson, *Hosea. HAT* XIV (^{3}1964), 20.

19. Vg., Tg., Rashi, Ibn Ezra, Kimchi; see the texts in A. Wünsche, *Der Prophet Hosea* (1868), 183-87; instead of "princes," Wünsche proposes "protectors," from *gnn,* "defend."

20. Rudolph, *Habakuk. KAT* XIII/3 (1975), 218.

21. G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 200: gloss; F. Horst, *Hiob. BK* XVI/1 (1968), 139, 142: transposition of v. 15aα and β.

22. McKane, *Proverbs,* 215; H. Ringgren, *Sprüche. ATD* XVI/1 (^{3}1980), 24.

23. Plöger, *BK* XVII, 41; Andersen and Freedman, *Hosea,* 355-58, discussing Hos. 4:7.

24. G. Sauer, *JSHRZ* III/5, 518; M. H. Segal, *Spr ben syr' hšlm* (^{2}1958), 33.

shame *(k^eḇôḏām b^eqālôn 'āmîr)*." In other words, Yahweh will transmute the honor enjoyed by the priests on account of their status into contempt and dishonor. (This interpretation follows MT and LXX;[25] if the third person pl. *hēmîrû* is read with Tg. and Syr.,[26] *kāḇôḏ* is either the reality of Yahweh [displaced by idols], as in Ps. 106:20 and Jer. 2:11 [cf. *tiqqune sopherim: k^eḇôḏî*[27]], or the [neglected] knowledge of God.[28]) Prov. 18:3, "When wickedness comes, contempt comes also, and with dishonor comes disgrace *(w^e'im qālôn ḥerpâ)*," speaks of the public disgrace incurred by wickedness.[29] In Sir. 3:10, in a commentary on the commandment to honor one's parents, *qālôn* should probably be understood as active disparagement or humiliation: "Do not glorify yourself by dishonoring your father *('l ttkbd bqlwn 'byk)*, for that is no glory to you" (cf. Dt. 27:16).

3. *Summary.* The texts in which *qlh* II occurs refer to a lessening of public respect, stature, and honor *(kāḇôḏ)*, either undergone (niphal) or imposed (hiphil). Sometimes there is a strong emphasis on social role or status (1 S. 18:23; Isa. 3:5; Prov. 12:9; Sir. 11:6; 25:8). To the outward dimension, Dt. 27:16; Sir. 10:19,31; and 10:29 add an inward, ethical, and religious dimension justifying disparagement, contempt, and disgrace. In Sir. 11:6 this is due to God's providence; in Isa. 3:5 and 16:14 it is explicitly a consequence of God's judgment. It would be hard to trace the occurrences of the verb to a particular original situation or literary genre.

The noun *qālôn* almost always refers to diminished public respect or status, including disgrace and dishonor (cf. once more the common antonyms *kāḇôḏ/kbd* as well as the synonyms *ḥerpâ, bûz, šēm ra', mûm*). We find the inward, ethical dimension especially when *qālôn* denotes God's judgment. In Job 10:15 *qālôn* is undeserved; in Sir. 5:13 *qālôn* and *kāḇôḏ* are freely chosen. In Prov. 9:7 and 22:10 *qālôn* is the work of an incorrigible scoffer, and in Sir. 3:10 it comes from a disrespectful son. Usually, however, it is incurred through foolish and arrogant behavior (Prov. 3:35; 6:33; 11:2; 13:18; Sir. 31[34]:29). In prophetic texts, *qālôn* is the consequence of God's judgment on arrogance and wickedness (godlessness) in Israel (Hos. 4:7,18; Isa. 22:18; Jer. 13:26); but it can also punish the wickedness of the nations (Hab. 2:16; Nah. 3:5; Jer. 46:12; cf. also Ps. 83:17[16]). It occurs more frequently in prophetic texts than in early proverbial literature; nevertheless, the experience of contempt and dishonor as a consequence of arrogant and foolish behavior, a typical wisdom theme, may have inspired prophetic usage.

III. Dead Sea Scrolls. In the Dead Sea Scrolls we find only the subst. *qlwn*. It appears in 1QpHab 11:12 on Hab. 2:15-16, with reference to the priest "whose shame has exceeded his glory" *('šr gbr qlwnw mkbwdw)*. It may also be supplied in 1QpHab

25. With W. Rudolph, *Hosea. KAT* XIII/1 (1966), 98, 104.
26. *HAL*, III, 457.
27. Andersen and Freedman, *Hosea*, 355.
28. Wolff, 81, 92.
29. Reading the abstract noun with *BHS*.

11:15. In 1QH 12:25 the author confesses that he was formed from dust *lmqwr ndh w'rwt qlwn,* "to be a source of uncleanness and vile disgrace"; in a similar vein 1QH 13:15 says: "His counsel is in vile disgrace" *(swdw 'rwt qln).* Interpreting Hos. 2:11(9), 1QpHos[b] 2:12 says: "He smote them with hunger and nakedness, so that they fell prey to disgrace *(lhywt lqlw[n]).*"

Marböck

קלל *qll;* קַל *qal;* קְלָלָה *q*[e]*lālâ*

I. Etymology: 1. Semitic; 2. Similar Roots. II. Statistics. III. Semantics: 1. Verb; 2. Nominal Forms; 3. Lexical Field. IV. Theology. V. LXX. VI. Extrabiblical Usage: 1. Dead Sea Scrolls; 2. Rabbinic Literature.

I. Etymology.

1. *Semitic.* The root *qll* appears in all Semitic languages with the basic meaning "be small, light": Akk. *qalālu(m),* "light, small," *qallalu,* "inferior," *qallu,* "small," *qalliš,* "carelessly," etc.;[1] Aram. *qll,* "be small, light, young," *qlyl,* "light, quick,"[2] "contemptible,"[3] "insignificant";[4] Syr. *qal, qallîl,* "light, quick," *qallîlāṯā',* "lightness, quickness,

---

qll. J. Cathcart, "Treaty-Curses and the Book of Nahum," *CBQ* 35 (1973) 179-87; R. Fabris, "Segen, Fluch und Exorcizmus in der biblischen Tradition," *Conc* 21 (1985) 88-95; L. S. Ford, "The Divine Curse Understood in Terms of Persuasion," *Semeia* 24 (1982) 81-87; J. C. Greenfield and A. Shaffer, "Notes on the Curse Formula of the Tell Fekherye Inscription," *RB* 92 (1985) 47-59; J. Jeremias, *Kultprophetie und Gerichtsverkündigung in der späten Königszeit Israels. WMANT* 35 (1970), esp. 164-75; K. P. Jörns, "Segen — und kein Fluch?" *Berliner theologische Zeitschrift* 1 (1984) 255-73; C. A. Keller, "קלל *qll* leicht sein," *THAT,* II, 641-47; L. Markert, *Struktur und Bezeichnung des Scheltworts. BZAW* 140 (1977), esp. 315-17; J. Pedersen, "Seelenleben und Gemeinschaftsleben," in K. Koch, ed., *Um das Prinzip der Vergeltung in Religion und Recht des ATs. WdF* 125 (1972), 8-86, esp. 43-86; H. Schulz, "Zur Fluchsymbolik in der altisraelitischen Gebetsbeschwörung," *Symbolon* 9 (1986) 35-59; H. Seebass, "Garizim und Ebal als Symbole von Segen und Fluch," *Bibl* 63 (1982) 22-31; W. Speyer, "Fluch," *RAC,* VII, 1160-1288; K. Q. Sutherland, "The Futility Curse in the OT" (diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1982); V. Wagner, *Rechtssätze in gebundener Sprache und Rechtssatzreihen im israelitischen Recht. BZAW* 127 (1972), esp. 32-39; G. Wallis, "Der Vollbürgereid in Deuteronomium 27,15-26," *HUCA* 45 (1974) 47-63; M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (1972), esp. 116-46; M. Weiss, "The Pattern of the 'Execration Texts' in the Prophetic Literature," *IEJ* 19 (1969) 150-57; W. Wiefel, "Fluch und Sakralrecht," *Numen* 16 (1969) 211-33.

→ אלה *'ālâ;* → ארר *'rr;* → ברך *brk;* → נקב *nqb.*

1. *AHw,* II, 893-94.
2. Ahiqar, 38, 112.
3. Ahiqar, 141.
4. *DISO,* 259; I. N. Vinnikov, *Palestinskiy Sbornik* 13 (1965) 233.

shortness";[5] Ugar. *ql,* "be(come) inferior, bad";[6] Can. *yaqillini,* "he despises me";[7] Arab. *qalla,* "be little, scarce";[8] Eth. *qalala,* "small, light, quick," *aqlala,* "lighten, despise."[9]

2. *Similar Roots.* It is disputed whether both *qll* and *qly* with its derivatives (niphal, "be contemptible"; hiphil, "treat with contempt"; *qālôn,* "disgrace, dishonor") go back to a common biliteral root;[10] it is also disputed whether the adj. *qālāl,* "smooth, polished" (Ezk. 1:7; Dnl. 10:6), as well as the verbal forms *qlql,* "whet" (Eccl. 10:10), "shake" (Ezk. 21:26[Eng. 21]), and *hitqalqēl,* "be shaken" (Jer. 4:24), derive from an independent homonymous root *qll* II.[11]

II. Statistics. There are 128 occurrences of the root *qll* and its derivatives in the OT: qal 12, niphal 11, piel 40 (including 8 in 2 Samuel and 7 in Leviticus), pual 3, hiphil 13, and the noun *qᵉlālâ* 33 times (including 11 in Deuteronomy and 9 in Jeremiah). In addition, both the piel and the noun occur 3 times each in Sirach.

III. Semantics. All verbal and nominal forms can be understood semantically as reflecting a basic meaning "be small, light, easy."

1. *Verb.* The verb, nevertheless, has undergone significant semantic differentiation in its various stems. This differentiation is evident even in the qal (G stem) *qālal,* which when constructed with *min* always means "swifter than": eagles (2 S. 1:23, of Saul and Jonathan; Jer. 4:13, of horses), leopards (Hab. 1:8, of horses), "a weaver's shuttle" or "a runner" (Job 7:6 and 9:25, both referring to the days of Job's life). In other constructions we find such meanings as "diminish, subside" (Gen. 8:8,11: the waters of the deluge), "be very small" (Job 40:4: Job's response to a theophany), "be discredited" (Gen. 16:4-5: Sarai, who is childless, in the eyes of her pregnant slave Hagar). The qal is used in semantic antithesis to → כבד *kāḇēḏ,* which has the basic meaning "be weighty (physically and socially), be important," and can therefore mean "be honored," just as the noun → כבוד *kāḇôḏ* can mean "honor." See, e.g., 1 S. 2:30: "Those who honor me *(mᵉḵabbᵉḏay)* I will honor *(ʾᵃḵabbēḏ),* and those who despise me shall be treated with contempt *(yēqallû).*" Someone who has lost honor has lost all social significance *(qallôṯā)* and deserves nothing more than a grave (Nah. 1:14).

For the niphal, the meaning "be swift" is found only in Isa. 30:16 (pursuers). Elsewhere it means "be trivial, easy": it is not a trivial matter for David to become the

5. *LexSyr.*

6. *KTU,* 3.1, 5; M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *WO* 3 (1966), 212; M. Dietrich and J. Sanmartín, *UF* 7 (1975) 166.

7. EA 245:38.

8. Wehr, 782.

9. *LexLingAeth,* 410.

10. G. Botterweck, *Der Triliteralismus im Semitischen. BBB* 3 (1952), 40-45; → קלה *qlh.*

11. Keller, 641-42.

king's son-in-law (1 S. 18:23); it is too easy for a shadow to run its normal course (2 K. 20:10); knowledge comes easily to one who understands (Prov. 14:6). In Jer. 6:14 and 8:11 the syntagm *'al-nᵉqallâ* means "carelessly." The niphal can also take on the meaning "still be too little" (2 S. 6:22; 1 K. 16:31; 2 K. 3:18; Isa. 49:6; Ezk. 8:17).

The hiphil means "lighten, ease": judges will make Moses' work easier (Ex. 18:22); God may lighten his hand, i.e., ameliorate his punishment (1 S. 6:5); a yoke — taxes and forced labor — may be lightened (1 K. 12:4,9 par. 2 Ch. 10:4,9-10); sailors lighten a ship caught in a storm (Jon. 1:5). Here too *kbd* serves as an antonym. According to Isa. 23:9, Yahweh has determined to make negligible *(lᵉhāqēl)* all the honored of the earth *(nikbaddê 'āreṣ)*, stripping them of their influence and honor. According to Isa. 8:23(9:1), Yahweh "brought into contempt *(hēqal)* the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali"; ultimately, however, he will restore that region to glory (*kbd* hiphil). According to 2 S. 19:44(43), the tribes of northern Israel complain to David that, even though they outnumber Judah and Benjamin ten to two, he has ignored them as a negligible quantity *(hᵉqillōṯanî)*. Ezk. 22:7 charges the inhabitants of Judah with treating father and mother with contempt.

The piel, too, can reflect the basic meaning "be small, light, easy," giving the sense "make small, deprive someone of their stature or importance (through words or actions), make contemptible." When parents are the object, the meaning is "dishonor, disparage," or the like. Such behavior is a capital offense (Ex. 21:17; Lev. 20:9; cf. Prov. 20:20; 30:11; Sir. 3:11,16). Before his single combat with David, Goliath "belittles" David as the Homeric warriors belittled their opponents, casting aspersions on his honor (1 S. 17:43). Gaal and his kinsfolk similarly disparage Abimelech during a wild drinking bout (Jgs. 9:27-28). Eli's sons even "belittle" God by their conduct at the sanctuary, i.e., they are to blame for the inability of the pilgrims to take God and the sanctuary seriously (1 S. 3:13). According to Lev. 24:11-16,23, a blasphemer blasphemes *(nqb)* Yahweh's name, thereby "belittling" Yahweh, vilifying him and speaking contemptuously of him. Disparaging, contemptuous speech is also referred to in Lev. 19:14: "You shall not (verbally) abuse the deaf." Eccl. 7:21-22 probably makes a similar point: as a rule, superiors do not hear the disparaging words of their inferiors; even if they do, they should not be upset, because they have themselves frequently disparaged others. Eccl. 10:20 cautions against disparaging the king or the rich even in one's bedroom, because the walls have ears.

But if one wants nothing to do with some people and therefore wants to "put them down," one does not just insult them but curses and reviles them. Therefore the piel often takes on the meaning "curse, revile." In such contexts it often appears in conjunction with → ארר *'rr* and in contrast to → ברך *brk* piel; an example is Gen. 12:3: "I will bless those who bless you, and the one who curses you I will curse *(mᵉqallelᵉkā 'ā'ōr]*." According to Dt. 23:5(4), Josh. 24:9, and Neh. 13:2, Balaam was expected to "revile" *(lᵉqallēl)* Israel; the Balaam narrative (Nu. 22:6,12; 23:7; 24:9) instead uses *'rr*, "curse," without any apparent difference in meaning. In 2 S. 16:5,7,9-13, and 19:22(21), the piel of *qll* could be interpreted as "disparage, insult, belittle," since the text does not describe Shimei as actually cursing David but as insulting him and throwing stones at him; however, 1 K. 2:8 requires us to interpret *qillēl* in both contexts as

"curse," because here David says to Solomon: *qil^{e}lanî q^{e}lālâ nimreṣeṯ,* "He cursed me with a dangerous curse." And of course Elisha "cursed" *(way^{e}qall^{e}lēm)* the small boys who made fun of him, since they were mauled by bears immediately afterward (2 K. 2:24). "Cursing" is also meant when the object of *qillēl* is a debtor who refuses to pay or a creditor who is pressing for payment (Jer. 15:10). Used in parallel with *brk* piel in Ps. 62:5(4) and 109:28, *qll* piel can only mean "curse." The same is true in Neh. 13:25; Job 3:1; Prov. 30:10; Sir. 4:5. But what is the meaning of *l^{e}qallēl* in Gen. 8:21, since there is no mention of any actual curse in the whole deluge narrative? Here too we can probably follow the ancient versions *(katarásasthai, maledicere)* in translating the verse: "I will never again curse the earth."

The situation differs when God is the object of *qll* piel. The verb *'rr* never has God as its object, probably because it appeared inconceivable actually to curse God; one could, however, "belittle" or "revile" God. Therefore *'rr* with a human object sometimes appears alongside *qll* piel with God as object: "You shall not revile God or curse a leader of your people" (Ex. 22:27[28]). In Lev. 24:11,14-15,23, the piel of *qll* with God as object appears alongside *nqb,* "blaspheme," with the name of God as object; here too the best translation is something like "revile."

We find a different construction in Isa. 8:21: *w^{e}qillēl b^{e}malkô ûḇē'lōhāyw.* Here too the usual translation is: "He [the hungry individual] will curse his king and God." But the formula more closely resembles the construction *bārēḵ b^e,*[12] "bless in the name of." A better translation would therefore be: "He will curse and revile, irreverently calling on the name of the king and God." Or could the passage even mean: "He will curse, consigning the one who deserted him to the judgment of the king and of God"?

The pual is similar to the piel. Ps. 37:22 uses the ptcp. *m^{e}qullālāyw* in parallel with *m^{e}ḇōrāḵāyw:* "Those blessed by him [God] shall inherit the land, but those cursed by him shall be cut off." According to Job 24:18, the portion in the land allotted to the wicked is cursed *(t^{e}qullal).* The usual translation of Isa. 65:20 is: "[In the messianic age of salvation] one who fails to reach the age of 100 will be considered accursed *(y^{e}qullal)*"; also possible is ". . . will be considered insignificant."

2. *Nominal Forms.* The adj. *qal* clearly preserved the basic meaning "light" in the expression *qal b^{e}raglāyw,* "light on his feet, swift" (2 S. 2:18; Am. 2:15). Even used by itself, *qal* can mean "swift" (Isa. 18:2; 19:1; Jer. 46:6; Am. 2:14; Eccl. 9:11; Lam. 4:19). This sense is explicit when *qal* is linked with *m^{e}hērâ,* "speedily" (Isa. 5:26; Joel 4:4[3:4]). Jer. 2:23 compares the fickle nation to a "restive young camel" *(biḵrâ qallâ)* turning this way and that. Hence *qal* can also mean "racehorse" (Isa. 30:16). Various emendations of *qal-hû'* have been proposed in Job 24:18, but they are unnecessary: "They [the ungodly] are light on the face of the waters," i.e., they drift aimlessly as if floating on water. The meaning "be light, insignificant," also explains the adj. *q^{e}lōqēl* in combination with "bread, food." In Nu. 21:5 the grumbling Israelites call the manna "this wretched food." In Jer. 3:9 many lexicographers and exegetes understand the

12. → ברך *brk.*

noun *qōl* as meaning "careless (adultery)," but the more likely meaning is "noise of adultery," i.e., "raucous adultery."[13]

The only meaning of the noun *qᵉlālâ,* which is frequently contrasted with *bᵉrāḵâ,* is "curse." Because he has deceived his father, Jacob is afraid that he will bring on himself "a curse instead of a blessing," but his mother responds: *ʿālay qilᵉlāṯᵉḵā,* "(if so) then let your curse be/come upon me" (Gen. 27:12-13). In the first instance, "curse" refers to words spoken by Jacob's father; but clearly the notion of the mischief wrought by the curse also plays a role. The same combination of verbal expression and the mischief it causes is present in Deuteronomy. According to Dt. 11:26-29, Yahweh sets before Israel "a blessing and a curse." This "setting" consists in reciting a blessing on those who keep the covenant and curses (using the *ʾārûr* formula reinforced by *ʾāmēn*) on those who transgress the covenant; these blessings and curses are recited by the representatives of the people on Mt. Gerizim and by the Levites on Mt. Ebal (Dt. 27). In 28:15,45 and 29:26(27), *kol-haqqᵉlālôṯ* refers to the curses recited in 28:16-45, some of which use an *ʾārûr* formula. In 30:1 and 19, similarly, *habbᵉrāḵâ wᵉhaqqᵉlālâ,* "that I have set before you," refers to the blessings and curses recited in 28:1-13,16-45; undoubtedly, though, it also includes their consequent banes and benefits. By contrast, Josh. 8:34 refers only to the words, not the substance: "Joshua read all the words of the law, blessings and curses, according to all that is written in the book of the law." But formulas and their consequences can hardly be kept separate when Dt. 23:6(5) and Neh. 13:2 state that God turned Balaam's (intended) curse into a blessing. Similarly, the "curse of Jotham" that came on the inhabitants of Shechem (Jgs. 9:57) refers both to the words of the curse spoken by Jotham (9:20) and to the disaster that struck the city. When David voices the hope that Yahweh will repay him with good "instead of his curse" (2 S. 16:12), *qilᵉlāṯô* means both the words of the curse that Shimei hurled at him and the calamity they threaten. Later, therefore, David can call this curse "dangerous" (*qᵉlālâ nimreṣeṯ,* 1 K. 2:8).

The expression *hāyâ/nāṯan liqᵉlālâ,* "become/make a curse," is used formulaically in 2 K. 22:19; Jer. 24:9; 25:18; 26:6; 42:18 (here with *lᵉʾālâ*); 44:8,12,22; 49:13; Zec. 8:13. The meaning is clear from Jer. 29:22: the exiles use the false prophets as the subject of a *qᵉlālâ,* saying: "May Yahweh make you like Zedekiah and Ahab, whom the king of Babylon roasted in the fire." In other words, the curse expresses the wish that someone suffer the same fate as Zedekiah and Ahab. This formula parallels the expression "become/make a blessing"[14] (cf. Zec. 8:13). Sir. 41:9 should probably be understood in a similar sense: "When you [the wicked] die, your death will be a curse" *(lqllh).* In other words, blessings will not honor your memory; instead, curses will cite your premature and dishonorable death as a cautionary example.

All these texts treat a curse as effectual and very dangerous, reflecting the fear that the calamity described will come to pass unless God expressly annuls the curse (Dt. 23:6[5]; Neh. 13:2). Prov. 26:2, however, denies the power of an undeserved curse:

---

13. → קול *qôl.*
14. → ברך *brk.*

"Like a sparrow in its flitting, like a swallow in its flying, an undeserved curse *(qil^e^lat ḥinnām)* goes nowhere."

The meaning of Ps. 109:17 is unclear: the psalmist's enemy "loved cursing *(q^e^lālâ);* let curses come on him; he did not like *b^e^rāḵâ;* may it be far from him; he clothed himself with *q^e^lālâ* like a coat." Does this refer to curses upon the devout psalmist continually uttered by the enemy, which will instead come upon him and bring him calamity, or is the curse the calamity unleashed by the machinations of the enemy, surrounding him on all sides like a coat? Also unclear is Prov. 27:14: "Whoever blesses (*brk* piel) a neighbor with a loud voice, early in the morning it will be counted as a curse *(q^e^lālâ).*" This appears to mean that one should not utter blessings with abandon; they might arouse suspicion and be mistaken for curses.[15] The meaning of Dt. 21:23 is also disputed: a criminal hung on a stake must be taken down and buried on the same day, "for anyone hung on a stake is a curse of God *(qil^e^laṯ ^e^lōhîm)*" (cf. 11QT 64:11-12). Why is this, and what does "curse of God" mean? Sir. 3:9, however, is clear: "A father's blessing strengthens the root; a mother's curse *(qllt 'm)* uproots the young plant." Here the parents' blessing on a son who honors them is the wish that he may prosper; their curse is the wish that an undutiful son may suffer affliction.

3. *Lexical Field.* We observe some semantic overlap between the root *qly*[16] with its verbal and nominal derivatives and the qal, niphal, and hiphil of *qll* and the adj. *qal,* when the meaning is "be(come) despised, disdained," "scorn, disgrace, shame." Only the piel, the pual, and the noun *q^e^lālâ* exhibit semantic affinities with *'ālâ, 'rr, nqb, qbb* and their derivatives, with the meaning "curse" (verb and noun). There are, however, clear distinctions.

The verb *'lh* always denotes a conditional curse upon oneself or others in the context of an oath, a binding promise, a treaty, a (contractual or covenantal) obligation, or the like; it threatens only the party breaking the agreement. Therefore *'lh* often stands alongside *šb'* niphal, "swear," and *š^e^ḇû'â,* "oath"[17] (Gen. 24:37,41; 26:28,31; Nu. 5:21; Neh. 10:30[29]), or → ברית *b^e^rîṯ* (Gen. 26:28; Dt. 29:13[14]; Ezk. 16:59; 17:16-19). Such an "oath curse" can consist in recital of the *'ārûr* formula (1 S. 14:24); the curses using this same formula in Dt. 27:15-26 and 28:16-19 can occasionally (but only in late texts) be summarized as the *'ālâ* or *'ālôṯ* "written in this book" (Dt. 29:19-20[20-21]; 30:7; Dnl. 9:11; 2 Ch. 34:24). Never, however, do we find an *'ālâ* referred to subsequently as a *q^e^lālâ.* In Jer. 42:18 and 44:12, "become an *'ālâ*" and "become a *q^e^lālâ*" stand side by side, but clearly not as total synonyms: formal oath curses as well as informal vituperation will cite the miscreant.

Clearly different from the piel and pual of *qll* are the verbal forms of *'rr* and the noun *m^e^'ērâ.* The verb always refers to the utterance of set curse formulas by a person with authority, such as God, the king, a parent, or a mantic with special powers, like

---

15. See comms. for further discussion of both passages.
16. → קלה *qlh.*
17. → שבע *šb'.*

Balaam (Gen. 3:14,17; 4:11; 9:25; 12:3; 49:7; Josh. 9:23; Jgs. 21:18; Nu. 22–24; Job 3:8). Formally to curse a "leader of one's own people" is an act of extraordinary presumption (Ex. 22:27[28]). Only rarely is the noun *m*ᵉ*'ērâ,* derived from *'rr,* used to denote such formal cursing (Dt. 28:20; Mal. 2:2; 3:9; Prov. 3:33; 28:27). More frequently, such cursing is denoted by *q*ᵉ*lālâ* (Dt. 11:26,28-29; 27:13; 28:15,45; 29:26[27]; 30:1,19; Josh. 8:34; Neh. 13:2). By contrast, the piel and pual of *qll* always refer to informal vituperation associated with insults and invective, such as is placed in the mouth of Goliath (1 S. 17:8-10,43), of Shimei (2 S. 16:5-8), and of Sennacherib's emissary outside Jerusalem (2 K. 18:19-35; 19:10-13); cf. also the piel of *qll* in Job 3:1. God can never be the object of *'rr;* one cannot formally curse God, but only "belittle" (*qll* piel) God with blasphemous vituperation. To do so, however, is a capital offense (Ex. 22:27[28]; Lev. 24:11-23). The latter text uses the piel of *qll* together with *nqb* or *qbb,* with the name of Yahweh as object, probably meaning "pronounce the name of Yahweh clearly and distinctly."[18] The situation is different in the case of *q*ᵉ*lālâ:* it can denote formal cursing as well as informal vituperation and insult.

IV. Theology. The role played by the various forms of cursing in the religion and popular belief of Israel is discussed elsewhere.[19] Of course many OT texts can be labeled as curses even though they do not use any of the typical terms for "curse." Lev. 26:14-38, for example, would have to be characterized as an *'ālâ* sanctioning the Holiness Code. Jer. 17:18 and 18:18-23 can be categorized as *q*ᵉ*lālôṯ.* The proclamation of the *'ārûr* formula to inculcate the law (cf. Dt. 27–28) and the curses in Lev. 26, which can be called *'ālôṯ,* probably had a cultic setting, i.e., they were recited when the law was proclaimed at the sanctuary.

It is noteworthy that the terms for "curse" occur infrequently in the preaching of the prophets. It is therefore best to speak only of "curse elements" incorporated into prophetic oracles of judgment, especially when the *'ārûr* formula is used explicitly (as in Jer. 11:3; 19:5; and in the oracle against Moab in 48:10) or when the prophet uses such words as "they shall become a desolation, a disgrace, a taunt, and a curse [*q*ᵉ*lālâ* or *'ālâ*]" to threaten his people, Jerusalem, Judah (Jer. 24:9; 25:18; 26:6; 42:18; 44:8,12,22), false prophets (29:22), or an enemy city (49:13).

In the earlier period a curse (esp. one denoted by *'rr*) was considered an effectual and powerful utterance, able to inflict calamity. But even a *q*ᵉ*lālâ* like that of Shimei can be a "dangerous curse" (1 K. 2:8). Yahweh, however, can annul any curse (2 S. 16:12) and transform it into a blessing (Neh. 13:2). For the sage, an undeserved curse is totally meaningless (Prov. 26:2).

Taking the basic meaning of *qll,* "small, insignificant," as our starting point helps us understand the use of *brk* piel in Job 1:11 and 2:5,9, on the assumption that in these texts *brk* is a euphemism for *qll.* In this case Satan and Job's wife expect Job not to curse God but to "belittle" God, to declare God insignificant, weak, and helpless. Then

---

18. → נקב *nqb;* → קבב *qbb.*
19. → אלה *'ālâ;* → ארר *'rr;* → נקב *nqb.*

there is no tension between Job's vigorous attacks on God in the dialogue and his vindication in 42:7. Job has not done what he was expected to do: he has not "belittled" God. On the contrary, he has recognized and acknowledged God as supremely powerful, transcending all human judgment.

V. LXX. Depending on the context and reflecting the meanings discussed above, the LXX uses various translations for the derivatives of the root *qll.* The adj. *qal* is represented by *drómos, elaphrós,* and *koúphos;* the qal of the verb is represented by *kouphízein, kopázein,* and *exállesthai;* the niphal by *exouthenoún* and *eucharḗs/mikrós eínai;* the piel by *atimázein, drásthai, kakṓs eipeín/ereín, kakologeín,* and *katarásthai;* the hiphil by *kouphízein, atimázein,* and *hybrízein;* the noun *qᵉlālâ* is represented by *ará, katára,* and *katárasis.*

VI. Extrabiblical Usage.

1. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* The Dead Sea Scrolls published to date use several derivatives of the root *qll.* Here the adj. *ql* has the meaning "swift" (1QpHab 2:12, of the Kittim; 6:2, of horses). Aram. *qlylyn* (11QtgJob 13:8 and 31:3) refers to swiftly passing clouds. In 1QSb 5:29 the *qlykh* are probably the rapidly spreading members of the sect. The noun *qllh* means "curse." The plural in 1Q22 1:10 refers to curses pronounced upon those who violate the covenant; in 4Q176 21:2 the text is fragmentary and the context unclear. The piel invariably means "curse," or more precisely "pronounce the *'ārûr* formula over" enemies and those who prove disloyal (1QS 2:4,10; 7:1; 5Q11 1:2 [reconstructing the fragmentary text]; 4Q511 11:3). The occurrences in 11QT 64:10,12 are discussed elsewhere.[20]

2. *Rabbinic Literature.* Rabbinic Hebrew texts use the piel and the noun *qᵉlālâ* only with the meaning "curse." The qal, the hiphil, and the adj. *qal* can take on the meaning "be light, swift, insignificant," "declare insignificant, belittle," etc. In Aramaic texts we find *qᵉlal* with its derivatives, as well as the noun *qᵉlālâ,* "(consider) light, contemn, scorn," etc. Only the aphel and (very rarely) the noun can take on the meaning "curse." Modern Hebrew still preserves this semantic variety of the root *qll.*

Scharbert

---

20. See III.3 above; → XI, 277.

קֵן *qēn;* קנן *qnn*

I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences; 3. LXX. II. 1. Physical Object; 2. Figurative Usage; 3. Family.

I. 1. *Etymology.* The Hebrew primary noun *qēn* (pl. *qinnîm*) is well attested with the meaning "nest" in Israel's environs: Akk. *qinnu,* "nest," but also "family";[1] Arab. *ka/inn,* "nest, home, refuge";[2] Middle Heb., Aram. *qēn, qi(î)nnā',* "nest," but also "a pair of sacrificial birds";[3] Syr. *qēn, qēnnā',* "nest";[4] Mand. *qina',* "nest, family."[5] As a rule the gemination of the final consonant distinguishes it from all the occurrences of the Heb. root → קָנֶה *qāneh,* "reed," to which it is etymologically unrelated. From the same root there is a denominative verb *qnn,* "nest"; analogous verbs occur in other Semitic languages: Akk. *qanānu;*[6] Arab. *kanna,* which also means "cover, protect";[7] Middle Heb., Aram. *qnn;*[8] Syr. *qnn;*[9] Mand. *qnn.*[10]

2. *Occurrences.* There are 13 occurrences of the noun: 4 in the Pentateuch, 2 in Isaiah, once each in Jeremiah, Obadiah, and Habakkuk, 2 in Job, once each in Psalms and Proverbs; there are 5 occurrences of the verb in the geminate stems: once in Isaiah, two in Jeremiah (22:23 *Q*), once in Ezekiel, and once in Psalms. Occurrences outside the MT include Sir. 14:26; 36:31 (noun); 37:30 (verb, which the LXX renders with a form of *eínai*), as well as 1QH 4:8-9. The noun occurs frequently in Mish. *Qinnim* ("a pair of sacrificial birds"), and may be assumed in 11QT 65:1-2, where the text is fragmentary.

3. *LXX.* As a rule the LXX translates *qēn* with *nossiá.* In Isa. 16:2 we find *neossós,* with no difference in meaning. In Jer. 49:16 the LXX (30:16) has a different text than the MT. In Job 29:18 the MT is paraphrased. The verb *qnn* is translated uniformly with *nosseúein.*

II. 1. *Physical Object.* In the OT, with one exception, nests are inhabited by birds. The text may speak of birds in general (*'ôp,* Isa. 16:2; Ezk. 31:6) or be more specific:

---

qēn. → יונה *yônâ;* → נשׁר *nešer;* → עוף *'ôp;* → צפור *ṣippôr.*

1. *AHw,* II, 922; *CAD,* Q, 257-60.
2. Lane, I/7, 2633.
3. Jastrow, 1387.
4. *CSD,* 509.
5. *MdD,* 411.
6. *AHw,* II, 897; *CAD,* Q, 80-81.
7. Lane, I/7, 2633.
8. Jastrow, 1287.
9. *CSD,* 509.
10. *MdD,* 414.

nešer, griffon vulture" (Dt. 32:11 [here perhaps simply a large bird of prey];[11] Jer. 49:16 par. Ob. 4; Job 39:27), a small bird (*ṣippôr*, Dt. 22:6; Ps. 84:4[Eng. 3]; Prov. 27:8; Ps. 104:17), a swallow (*d^erôr*, Ps. 84:4[3]), a dove (*yônâ*, Ps. 55:7[6]), or a stork (*ḥ^asîḏâ*, Ps. 104:17).[12] Only in Isa. 34:15, in a list of demonic creatures, is the arrow snake *(qippôz)* mentioned.

Nothing is said about the material used for nests; even in regions where vegetation was sparse, the usual materials were probably employed. Trees are the preferred location for nests (Dt. 22:6; Jer. 22:23; Ezk. 31:6; Ps. 104:17) because of the special protection they offer. In Ps. 104:17 it is Yahweh who provides trees to protect the birds. Ezk. 31:6 compares Pharaoh to a unique, life-giving tree. Other texts, especially those contrasting a nest with ordinary human life, emphasize the security of its location high in the mountains (Nu. 24:21; Jer. 49:16 par. Ob. 4 ["among the stars"]; Hab. 2:9; Job 39:27). Ps. 84:4(3) presupposes that nests were built in the crannies of walls; Jer. 48:28 ("crevices in the rock") is similar. Dt. 22:6 mentions a nest on the ground by the roadside. The earliest core of this text (vv. 6a,7a) prohibits simultaneous removal of a bird and its young from their nest, probably on account of an ancient taboo (cf., e.g., Ex. 23:29b) rather than for humanitarian reasons.[13] It was common practice, however, to gather eggs from deserted nests (Isa. 10:14).

2. *Figurative Usage.* The OT is fond of using birds and their nests to describe human life and behavior. The bird staying in its nest is a symbol of stability, security, and protection; similarly, leaving the nest and an empty nest itself (Isa. 10:14) represent exposure and vulnerability. Frequently, therefore, we find *bayiṯ*, "house," and forms of *yšb*, "dwell," side by side with statements about nests. For example, the pilgrim in the temple finds a home there as the swallow finds her nest (Ps. 84:4[3]). In an oracle of judgment Isa. 34:15 emphasizes stability. In Ezk. 31:6 and Ps. 104:17 it is the trees themselves that provide protection for the animals (and human beings). Some oracles against foreign nations show that loss of one's home was perceived as a severe punishment. Although they feel safe in their "nests," they will fall victim to Yahweh's judgment: he will drive them from the remotest heights. There is no place where a human being can flee from Yahweh (Isa. 16:2; Jer. 49:16 par. Ob. 4; also Nu. 24:21 [J^S], a secondary addition to the Balaam oracles that uses a play on the words *qēn* and *qayin* [cj.] to threaten the Kenites with disaster). Misguided attempts to achieve security independently are attacked by Jer. 22:23 and Hab. 2:9. These passages illustrate the importance to the Israelite of a settled, permanent residence. Prov. 27:8 represents the voluntary sacrifice of one's protective environment as irrational and contrary to nature.[14] Only in "his place" *(m^eqômô)* does the individual experience the protection of the community. The homeless are met with skepticism (Sir. 36:31). Rooms in the ark for protection

11. O. Keel, *Jahwes Entgegnung an Ijob. FRLANT* 121 (1978), 69.
12. O. Keel et al., *Orte und Landschaften der Bibel*, I (Zurich, 1984), 161.
13. For the former see O. Keel, *Das Böcklein in der Milch seiner Mutter und Verwandtes. OBO* 33 (1980), 44-45; for the latter, G. von Rad, *Deuteronomy. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1966), 141.
14. H.-J. Hermisson, *Studien zur israelitischen Spruchweisheit. WMANT* 28 (1968), 78.

against the deluge are suggested by Gen. 6:14 (P); the double accusative object does not require the repetition of *qinnîm.*[15] The meaning "chambers" is supported by Gilg. xi.62, which parallels Gen. 6:14.[16]

3. *Family.* The false security of building one's own nest stands in contrast to the security of the nest protected by Yahweh. Dt. 32:11, which may go back to an early source (cf. also Ex. 19:4),[17] pictures the relation of Yahweh to Israel as that of a *nešer* to its nest. Here "young" is probably a better translation than "nest" (cf. Akk. *qinnu;* also Sir. 14:26). The image of a vulture circling menacingly high over the rocky crags provided a striking illustration of Yahweh's protection that Israel experienced.

It is disputed whether *qēn* should also be understood in this sense in Job 29:18 (*qinnî* = "my family"), or whether this text alludes to the myth of the phoenix, which is restored to life after being consumed by fire along with its nest.[18] In the latter case, *ḥûl* (cj.) should be understood as "phoenix."[19] But this interpretation is not persuasive: the central idea of the myth, the resurrection of the phoenix, is not a theme of Job (cf. 30:23). On the contrary, the Hebrews looked forward to attaining a great age (e.g., Gen. 25:8)[20] and dying in the bosom of the family (on the motif see Gen. 49; on death in a foreign land, Am. 7:17).

Mommer

15. *GK,* §117ii.

16. C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1984), 420; for a different interpretation see E. Ullendorf, *VT* 4 (1954) 96; and G. R. Driver, *VT* 4 (1954) 243, who find here a form of *qāneh,* "reed."

17. H. D. Preuss, *Deuteronomium. EdF* 164 (1982), 61.

18. A. Weiser, *Das Buch Hiob. ATD* XIII (^{7}1980), 206; P. Volz, *SAT* 3/2^2, 69; G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 410; etc. Cf. also LXX. For a discussion of the myth see A. Rusch, *PW,* XX/1, 414-23.

19. *KBL*^{2}, 282.

20. H. W. Wolff, *Anthropology of the OT* (Eng. trans. Philadelphia, 1974), 119-20.

קנא *qn';* קִנְאָה *qin'â;* קַנָּא *qannā';* קַנּוֹא *qannô'*

I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences; 3. Lexical Field. II. Secular Usage: 1. Jealousy; 2. Envy; 3. Zeal. III. Theological Usage: 1. *'ēl qannā';* 2. Yahweh's Jealousy; 3. Yahweh's Zeal. IV. 1. LXX and Vg.; 2. Dead Sea Scrolls.

qn'. H. Baumgart, *Jealousy* (Eng. trans. Chicago, 1990); W. Berg, "Die Eifersucht Gottes — ein problematischer Zug des alttestamentlichen Glaubens?" *BZ* 23 (1979) 197-211; K.-H.

I. 1. *Etymology.* Etymological investigation of the root *qn'* is unproductive. Lack of any semantic relationship rules out the phonetically similar Akk. *uqnû,* with the substantival meaning "lapis lazuli" and the secondary adjectival meaning "greenish-blue,"[1] as well as Arab. *qana'a,* "be red or black."[2] The adj. *qannā'u,*[3] which appears in one text from Boghazköy with the meaning "envious," as well as the nouns *qin'u* (Neo-Assyrian) and *qinnu* (Middle Babylonian), "envy,"[4] probably reflect Northwest Semitic influence. One Ugaritic occurrence ("I will be zealous for the name of the sons of the princes") recalls Ezk. 39:25.[5] There are more extensive occurrences (verb, noun, and adjective) in Aramaic with the meanings "(feel/arouse) jealousy or envy."[6] Middle Hebrew also uses the piel in a causative sense ("make jealous").[7] Eth.[8] and Amhar.[9] *qanna'a, qan'i,* and *qan'at* mean "jealousy" and "envy"; the same is true for Tigre[10] and Soqotri.[11] In Syriac, again, the root *qn'* expresses "zealous effort to attain something."[12]

2. *Occurrences.* The root *qn'* occurs a total of 85 times in the OT. The noun *qin'â* occurs 43 times. There are just 7 occurrences in the Pentateuch (Nu. 5:14 [twice],30; 25:11 [3 times]; Dt. 29:19[Eng. 20]), whereas we may note a concentration in Isaiah (7

Bernhardt, *Gott und Bild* (Berlin, 1956); A. van den Born, "Eifersucht Gottes," *BL*², 368-69; H. A. Brongers, "Der Eifer des Herrn Zebaoth," *VT* 13 (1963) 269-84; C. Dohmen, "'Eifersüchtiger ist sein Name' (Ex 34,14)," *TZ* 46 (1990) 289-304; P. Gibert, "Figures bibliques du monothéisme," in *idem,* M. Jourjon, and H. Bourjois, *Le monothéisme* (1985); E. Haag, ed., *Gott, der einzige. QD* 104 (1985); F.-L. Hossfeld, "Einheit und Einzigkeit Gottes im frühen Jahwismus," *FS W. Breuning* (1985), 57-74; O. Keel, ed., *Monotheismus im Alten Israel und seiner Umwelt. BBB* 14 (1980); K. Kliesch, "'Denn ich bin ein eifernder Gott,'" in P. von der Osten-Sacken, ed., *Wie aktuell ist das AT?* (1985), 67-72; F. Küchler, "Der Gedanke des Eifers Jahwes im AT," *ZAW* 28 (1908) 42-52; B. Lang, "Jahwe allein!" *Conc* 21 (1985) 30-35; N. Lohfink, "Das AT und sein Monotheismus," in K. Rahner, ed., *Der eine Gott und der dreieine Gott* (Munich, 1983), 28-47; *idem,* "God," in *idem, Great Themes from the OT* (Eng. trans. Chicago, 1982); A. Ohler, "Die vielen Götter und der eine Gott," *Katechetische Blätter* 107 (1982) 712-35; B. Renaud, *Je suis un dieu jaloux* (Paris, 1963); G. L. Richardson, "The Jealousy of God," *ATR* 10 (1927/28) 47-50; J. F. A. Sawyer, "Biblical Alternatives to Monotheism," *Theology* 87 (1984) 172-80; R. Schwager, "Der Zorn Gottes," *ZKT* 105 (1983) 406-14; H. Seebass, "Die Gottesbeziehung zur Göttergewalt der Völker im AT," in W. Strolz and H. Waldenfels, eds., *Christliche Grundlagen des Dialogs mit den Weltreligionen. QD* 98 (1983) 76-97; A. Stumpff, "ζῆλος, κτλ.," *TDNT,* II, 877-88.

1. *AHw,* III, 1426-27.
2. Brongers, 269-70.
3. *AHw,* II, 897.
4. W. von Soden, *Or* 46 (1977) 193.
5. *UT,* no. 2246; cf. M. Dahood, *Bibl* 52 (1971) 348.
6. *ANH,* 382.
7. *WTM,* IV, 332.
8. *LexLingAeth,* 445.
9. W. Leslau, *Hebrew Cognates in Amharic* (1969), 55, 63.
10. *WbTigre,* 252-53.
11. Leslau, *Contributions,* 47.
12. *LexSyr,* 675.

occurrences) and Ezekiel (10). There are 20 occurrences in the prophets, always (except in Isa. 11:13) with God as subject. Wisdom literature, by contrast, deals with human *qin'â* (19 occurrences). The adjs. *qannā'* (Ex. 20:5; 34:14 [twice]; Dt. 4:24; 5:9; 6:15) and *qannô'* (Josh. 24:19; Nah. 1:2) are used only with reference to God.[13] The verb occurs mostly in the piel (30 times); roughly half of all its occurrences are in theological contexts. All 5 occurrences with God as subject are in prophetic books (Ezekiel, Joel, Zechariah). There are just 4 occurrences of the hiphil (Dt. 32:21 [subj. God]; Dt. 32:16 [human subj.]; Ps. 78:58 [subj. Israel]; Ezk. 8:3 [subj. a cultic image]).

3. *Lexical Field.* The verb → אָהַב *'āhab* functions as both an antonym and a prerequisite (meeting of extremes) of *qn'*. Emotions associated with *qn'* include → אַף *'ap,* → חֵמָה *hēmâ,* and → כַּעַס *kā'as.* Words having to do with fire are used frequently to qualify *qn'*: → אֵשׁ *'ēš,* → בָּעַר *bā'ar,* → רֶשֶׁף *rešep.* The object can simply stand in the accusative or be introduced by the prep. *b*^{e} (Gen. 30:1; 37:11; Dt. 29:19[20]; 32:16,21; Ezk. 23:25; Ps. 37:1; 78:58; Prov. 3:31; 23:17; 24:1,19; in these cases *qn'* is directed against the object) or *l*^{e} (Nu. 11:29; 25:13; 2 S. 21:2; 1 K. 19:10,14; Ezk. 39:25; Joel 2:18; Zec. 1:14; 8:2; Ps. 106:16; here the action is on behalf of the object).

II. Secular Usage. In the human domain *qn'* refers primarily to a violent emotion aroused by fear of losing a person or object.[14] An association with the idea of ownership is suggested in Hebrew by the phonological similarity of *qn'* to → קנה *qānâ* (note the orthographic errors in Ezk. 8:3 and Ezr. 7:17),[15] but a psychological and semantic affinity should not be rejected out of hand.[16] In English a sense of entitlement to an object is described most often as envy, whereas a claim on a person is described as jealousy. The fact that Hebrew has only a single word to cover both aspects seems less surprising when we note, for example, that the languages of central Europe did not distinguish zeal, envy, and jealousy until after the Middle Ages.[17] Even today the distinction is not always entirely clear.

1. *Jealousy.* The statements in Nu. 5:14,15,18,25,29,30 are quite clear. Even if the verbs *śṭh* and *m'l* in v. 12b are somewhat vague about the nature of the wife's unfaithfulness, the expression *škb 'îš* in v. 13a shows that the subject is a sexual transgression. The *rûaḥ* that v. 14 describes as coming upon the deceived husband naturally has an aspect of rage and fury,[18] but this anger is an element of jealousy. It is therefore appropriate to call Nu. 5:11-31 a "jealousy ordeal." The situation is such that the objective crime of adultery cannot be proved; therefore the necessary conditions for a con-

---

13. On the *qaṭṭāl* form see O. Loretz, *Bibl* 41 (1960) 413-14.
14. See the definition of jealousy in E. H. Witte, *Lexikon der Psychologie,* I (^{2}1980), 416-17.
15. Baumgart, 81; Brongers, 283-84.
16. On the possible shift III *y* to III *h,* see G. Bergsträsser, *Hebräische Grammatik,* II (Leipzig, 1929), 158-59.
17. Baumgart, 120-28.
18. Brongers, 270-71; cf. *HAL,* III, 1111.

viction have not been met. The possibility of the wife's innocence (v. 14b) is a secondary addition.[19] A magical rite is therefore employed to resolve the question: the procedure laid out in vv. 15ff. combines a curse ritual with an ancient magic potion ritual. The designation of the grain offering as → קרבן *qorbān* is P terminology. The double reference to the offering as both *minḥaṯ zikkārôn* and *minḥaṯ qᵉnā'ōṯ* (v. 15) is noteworthy.[20] Both the construction (apart from Nu. 5 *minḥâ* appears only in Ex. 29:41; Lev. 2:14; 6:7,16[14,23]; Nu. 4:16) and the description of the offering itself (v. 15*) suggest a late date for this text, which presupposes familiarity with the legislation of Leviticus governing sacrifice.[21] The absence of any supplement to Nu. 5 treating a wife's jealousy is due to the patriarchal ideology of the OT: adultery is an infringement on the husband's property rights (cf. Ex. 20:17).[22] A man's infidelity is therefore of no moment unless it infringes on the rights of another man. A wife has no legal or cultic recourse.[23]

Prov. 6:34 speaks of fury[24] as a consequence of jealousy. The theme of 6:20-35 is a warning against the "strange woman"; vv. 33-35, expanding on v. 32, describe the treatment of the adulterer by the jealous husband: his vengeance extends to the death of his rival. In Nu. 5, by contrast, the "beloved(?)" wife is the object of her husband's *qin'â.* In general there is some ambiguity as to whether the object of jealousy is the partner or the rival.[25] Jealousy knows no mercy; therefore Prov. 27:4 also warns against this intensification of *ḥēmâ* and *'ap.*

Prov. 14:30 takes up the theme that jealousy is unhealthy for the jealous individual as well: it is a consuming disease that infects the lover, the antithesis of a *lēḇ marpē'.* This painful shadow side of love is also the theme of the theoretical musing in Cant. 8:6, where the power of jealous passion as an intensification of love is compared to the power of death and the netherworld. This passage also expresses the ambivalent position of jealousy between the extremes of love and death.[26] The text compares jealousy to *'ēš* and describes it as *rešep.*

Neither Prov. 14:30 nor Cant. 8:6 mentions the triangle constituted by the jealous individual, his rival, and his partner, which represents the fundamental constellation of jealousy. In these passages, therefore, *qn'* is better translated as "passion," although the similarity of the two terms needs to be kept in mind, since frequently jealousy is best understood as the actualization of passion confronted by a threat. In the face of mortality, even passions such as love, hate, and jealousy lose their power; Qoheleth can therefore counsel composure (Eccl. 9:6).

---

19. The whole section is analyzed by D. Kellermann, *Der Priesterschrift von Numeri 1:1 bis 10:10. BZAW* 120 (1970), 70-83.

20. → מנחה *minḥâ.*

21. See Kellermann, *Priesterschrift,* 82.

22. Brongers, 283.

23. → נאף *nā'ap;* see F.-L. Hossfeld, *Der Dekalog. OBO* 45 (1982), 132ff.

24. → חמה *ḥēmâ.*

25. See R. Sterba, "Eifersüchtig auf . . . ?" *Die psychoanalytische Bewegung* 2 (1930) 167-70.

26. See I.3 above; see also O. Keel, *ZBK* 18, 250.

2. *Envy.* Apart from the direct relationship between men and women, in some passages the emphasis is on the "envious" side of *qn'*.[27] In Gen. 26:13-14 (J) the description of Isaac's wealth and the use of *gdl* to describe his prosperity do not reflect the real situation of the patriarchs, who lived as marginal nomads. This language betrays the perspective and purpose of the later author, who was quite unfamiliar with this mode of life. Its function is to describe the conflict with the Philistines, which — since Isaac is represented as the heir of the blessing promised in Gen. 12:1-3 — ends with a peace treaty.

In Gen. 30:1 (J) the bearing of many children is the wellspring of rivalry. The expression *qn' bᵉ* referring to envy of the advantages enjoyed by others reappears in 37:11 as an introductory motif of the Joseph novella. The reason Joseph's brothers hate him is stated in vv. 3-4; *śn'* (vv. 4,8) and *qn' bᵉ* (v. 11) are virtually synonymous.

An end to hostility based on envy is described in Isa. 11:13, in a vision of the reconciliation of the two kingdoms of Israel. Reunification was clearly a pressing concern at the time this text was written. Since it presupposes Deutero-Isaiah and exhibits thematic parallels to Neh. 3:33–4:17(4:1-23) and Zec. 11:4-17, it probably dates from the period of Ezra and Nehemiah.

Ezk. 31:9, a redactional expansion of the description of the world tree in vv. 3-8, is the only instance of metaphorical usage of *qn'*: it "introduces a living and judging 'environment' for the tree."[28] The envy of the trees represents the rivalry of the great powers.

Wisdom texts caution about the negative consequences awaiting those who allow *qin'â* to influence them. In Job 5:2, for example, the statement that envy slays the simple accords with the traditional notion of the connection between conduct and its consequences. This notion also lies behind Prov. 24. In v. 1 the wisdom teacher cautions against envying *(qn' bᵉ)* the wicked and desiring *('wh)* to associate with them. The reason follows in v. 2: such association brings nothing but trouble. God's retribution according to everyone's deeds is impressed on the reader in v. 12b. In principle v. 19 admits two different translations: following the model of v. 1, we may translate "do not be jealous of them" or "do not envy them."[29] The reason, stated in v. 20, would then be that doing so jeopardizes one's own future (cf. v. 14). The other translation is based on the synonymous parallelism of *qn'* and *ḥrh* hithpael: "Do not brood over evildoers, for God will see to their end."[30] Such brooding would be wrong, because it would indicate a lack of trust in God's retribution. The same terminology appears once more in Ps. 37, a didactic psalm. The psalmist appeals to Yahweh's compensatory justice and counsels quiet patience (v. 7). The reappearance of *ḥrh* (v. 7) and the continuation with *'ap̱* and *ḥēmâ* suggest the translation "brood" in v. 1.[31]

The situation in Prov. 3:31 is comparable. The MT reads *tiḇḥar,* so that the warning

27. See I.1 above.
28. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1983), 150.
29. O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos. BK* XVII (1983), 283-84.
30. H. D. Preuss, *Einführung in die alttestamentliche Weisheitsliteratur* (1987), 39.
31. Cf. "fret" in H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–60* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1988), 401, 405.

against envy of *(bᵉ)* the wicked is coupled with a warning against imitating them out of envy. This would fit with the first translation of 24:19. If, however, we accept the LXX reading *zēlōtḗs,* representing a synonym of *qn'* (*BHS* suggests *tiṯhar*), we face the same problem as in 24:19. But the antithetical motivation in v. 32 indicates rather that the wicked are not to be envied because they will meet the end they deserve.

A play on words may lie behind Prov. 23:17: v. 17a clearly expresses a pejorative opinion of zeal, whereas v. 17b in typical wisdom style extols the knowledge of God as a goal to be sought zealously. The traditional view comes to an end in the "crisis of wisdom." Quite in the manner of the book of Job, Ps. 73 (sometimes called the "Job psalm") examines the sufferings of the righteous (v. 14) in the light of the prosperity of the wicked. The temptation to envy *(qn' bᵉ)* the wicked and imitate them (vv. 3,15) is great. This temptation explains the danger mentioned in v. 2. Here again the translation "envy"[32] is preferable to "brood."[33] Only a sense of God's presence even in suffering (vv. 17,23-28) enables the psalmist to see the futility of apparent prosperity.[34] If we accept Eccl. 4:4, *qn' (min)* is the fruit of all successful toil. The context (vv. 1-16), which discusses exploitation, and the pejorative evaluation in v. 4b indicate that the author has more in mind than "healthy competition."[35]

3. *Zeal.* The aspect of zeal stands in the foreground when *qn'* is constructed with *lᵉ*. In Nu. 11:29, for example, Joshua expresses zealous concern for Moses' prerogatives, almost acting in his place.

The parenthetical comment in 2 S. 21:2b (secondary; note the resumption of v. 2aβ by v. 3a) is a historicizing piece of ethnography based on Josh. 9 and inserted into the plague narrative (2 S. 21–24) by the Dtr historian.[36] It ascribes the bloodguilt infecting the royal house to Saul's attack on the Gibeonites *bᵉqannōʼṯô liḇnê yiśrāʼēl.*

Zeal for the house of God consumes the persecuted speaker of Ps. 69. Mention of the house of God suggests that the psalmist should be assigned to those circles that urged the building of the second temple (Zec. 7:3; Hag. 1:8ff.). His activity did not achieve its intended result, but merely elicited scorn (vv. 10-13[9-12]). Fervent zeal "for" (v. 10a[9a]) can be as consuming *(ʼāḵal)* as zeal "against." This holds true also in Ps. 119:139, although here the text has only "my zeal" without any explicit object. The context of the righteous individual suffering on behalf of Yahweh recalls that of 69:10(9). Ps. 119, however, focuses not on the temple (as LXX suggests by adding "for your house") but on the law (*ʻēḏōṯ,* v. 138; *tôrâ,* v. 142; *miṣwôṯ,* v. 143).

Noteworthy is the very late text Ps. 106:16; the reference to Nu. 16 presupposes the existence of the Pentateuch in its final form. The context indicates use of the wrong

32. See Kraus, *Psalms 61–150* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1989), 82.

33. Cf. *ibid.*, "was worked up about"; C. Westermann, *Ausgewählte Psalmen* (Göttingen, 1984), 98-107; H. Irsigler, *Psalm 73 — Monolog eines Weisen. ATS* 20 (1984), 63, evades the choice: "brood with envy."

34. Preuss, 108-9.

35. Brongers, 178.

36. T. Veijola, *Die ewige Dynastie. AASF* B 193 (1975), 106-7.

preposition: "be jealous of"[37] is usually expressed by b^e. Even postulating a hiphil form ("they tormented Moses"[38]), with LXX, does not help greatly, because there is no other instance of *qn'* hiphil with l^e. There is no convincing solution to the problem. The context suggests the translation "be envious of."

The texts in which, in a theological context, a human being is zealous for God constitute a distinct group. In 2 K. 10:16 Jehu's zeal finds violent expression in a revolution. This late Dtr verse anticipates the liquidation of the worshipers of Baal described by DtrN. Jehu's attack on Baal and his worshipers recalls the actions of Elijah and Elisha. Thus the Elijah narrative (1 K. 18:19,40) contains echoes of Jehu (2 K. 10), as well as similar terminology: in the context of a theophany (1 K. 19), Elijah describes his own actions as zeal for Yahweh *(figura etymologica).* Vv. 13b and 14 repeat vv. 9b and 10; the original locus of Elijah's statement about his zeal is not the theophany (vv. 1-13a) but the late Dtr commissioning (vv. 13b-18), introduced by Elijah's grievance. The "mistaken anticipation" in vv. 9b and 10 is due to a redaction that interpolates the dialogue into an encounter with God, elaborating it into a theophany.[39]

A final instance, likewise late, is Phinehas's zeal for "his God" (Nu. 25:11,13).[40]

III. Theological Usage. Roughly half of all the occurrences of the root have to do with God's jealousy. They are of substantial importance, since they concern the central characteristic of OT belief: Yahweh's demand that he alone be worshiped, enshrined in the great commandment.

The range of meanings noted in our analysis of secular usage suggests that we take "jealousy" as our point of departure for translating the root in theological contexts. Various scholars have rejected this starting point on the grounds that this translation represents "a crude anthropopathism . . . that he [God] would better do without."[41] Ultimately, however, this concern only serves the Stoic notion of divine impassibility, which is inconsistent with the biblical understanding of God[42] but is often espoused nevertheless by both Christian[43] and Jewish theology, creating problems of exegesis.[44]

1. *'ēl qannā'.* The adj. *qannā'* is associated directly with the noun *'ēl* in Ex. 20:5; 34:14; Dt. 4:24; 5:9; 6:15. All these texts involve a causal *(kî)* noun clause in the context of prohibiting the worship of other gods. In the two Decalogue passages and in the so-called prerogative law (Ex. 34), the words are a self-predication on the part of

---

37. Kraus, *Psalms 61–150,* 314, 319; NRSV.

38. Brongers, 275-76, citing Luther (although *eifern* and *eifersüchtig sein* were not semantically distinct in the 16th century [Baumgart, 94]).

39. R. Smend, *VT* 25 (1975) 526.

40. See III.3 below.

41. Brongers, 276.

42. Schwager, 408-9.

43. See Berg.

44. Stumpff, 880.

Yahweh. But the formulation of the individual passages differs in detail, so that we cannot speak of a formula in the strict sense.

If we start with the earlier legal corpus, the prerogative law of J, the first thing we notice is the repetition of *qannā'* in Ex. 34:14. The causal clause follows the earliest OT prohibition of the worship of other gods[45] and precedes the prohibition of making a covenant with the inhabitants of the land, which may be viewed as a consequence. The construction is grammatically ambiguous. Yahweh's name is the subject of the noun clause (v. 14b), on which depends another noun clause with *qannā'* as subject and *š^emô* as predicate *(casus pendens).* But it is also possible that *qannā'* stands in simple apposition to Yahweh. In the context of the proper name, the second naming is noteworthy. It is explained by the revelations of God's name in Ex. 3:14-15 and — more directly — 34:6: both express the singularity of Yahweh. In the second portion of the causal clause (v. 14b), the emphatic pronominal suffix makes clear that we are not dealing here with an epithet: the name identifies the very person of God. If jealousy is a critical element of the name of Yahweh, apart from any description of his nature or attributes, our attention must turn at once to the relationship between Yahweh and his worshipers. It is characterized by an intolerant demand for exclusivity: it is Yahweh's will "to be the only God for Israel, and . . . he is not disposed to share his claim for worship and love with any other divine power."[46] In substance, though not in language, the similarity to Hosea is unmistakable. With exemplary clarity, the latter uses the image of marriage to describe the relationship between Israel and its God (Hos. 2:4,7[2,5]; 3:1ff.; 4:16ff.; etc.).[47] The actions of the unfaithful wife represent the worship of other gods upon the high places, Israel's adoption of the Canaanite Baal cult. Yahweh is the husband who goes after his wife, brings her back, and admonishes her, maintaining his exclusive rights (13:4).[48] The Deuteronomists developed the notion of a marriage between Yahweh and Israel, introduced by Hosea, into a "covenant theology."[49] In Ex. 34:14 the figurative language about a jealous God is linked with Hoseanic theology to support Yahweh's demand to be Israel's sole God — i.e., monolatry. It therefore occupies a crucial position in the development of the OT notion of God, shaped primarily by the prophets of the northern kingdom and by the Yahwist. The theological milieu is still that of polytheism, but within that milieu a polemic line of demarcation establishes Yahweh's sole authority for his own people.

In contrast to the Decalogue's prohibition of other gods, Ex. 34:14 says nothing of any punishment or consequence if the commandment is not observed. In the course of Israel's history, however, this element took on great importance. In Dt. 5:9, therefore, the threatened punishment follows immediately after the statement that Yahweh is a jealous God. The dichotomy of steadfast love for the faithful and punishment for the faithless is borrowed from the confessional formula in Ex. 34:7, but with a characteris-

45. Hossfeld, "Einheit," 69.
46. G. von Rad, *OT Theology,* I (Eng. trans. New York, 1962), 208.
47. J. Jeremias, *Hosea. ATD* XXIV/1 (1983), in loc.
48. Lohfink, "Das AT," 29-30.
49. L. Perlitt, *Bundestheologie im AT. WMANT* 36 (1969), 139-52.

tic reversal: first the threat of punishment, which is directed against Israel,[50] and only then the promise of salvation. The punishment and reward stipulated in Dt. 5:9 refer not only to the prohibition of idols but also to the prohibition of other gods in v. 7.[51] Despite the interpolated prohibition of idols, the text thus takes into account the close relationship, established by Ex. 34:14, between the prohibition of other gods and the statement of Yahweh's jealousy. Since continued evolution toward monotheism made the prohibition of other gods more or less otiose but enhanced the importance of the prohibition of idols,[52] in Ex. 20:3 the prohibition of other gods is separated by asyndeton from the prohibition of idols, while the statement of Yahweh's jealousy remains associated with the latter.

Dt. 4:24 can totally ignore the prohibition of other gods. The textual environment (vv. 19-28) goes on to ground the prohibition of idols on Yahweh's jealousy, then describes at some length the consequences of disobedience,[53] as suggested by the present circumstances of the later Deuteronomist (cf. also 29:19). This terminology also accords with the interpretation of Yahweh's jealousy as "burning, consuming anger" (6:15). The allusion to the Decalogue in vv. 13ff. presupposes the latter's existence and suggests the same redactor for 6:10-18 as for 4:19-28.[54]

Finally we come to Josh. 24:19 and Nah. 1:2, with the adj. *qannô'*. In the "congress at Shechem," Joshua presents the people two alternatives: either serve Yahweh or fall into sin; the people choose to serve Yahweh (v. 16). Following this decision, Joshua's laconic statement in v. 19 appears unmotivated. The assurance with which vv. 19b and 20 speak of disaster also betrays an author who knows whereof he speaks, because he has lived through it.[55] The God who will not forgive is an element of Dtr thought. The expansion of *qannô'* by the addition of *qᵉḏōšîm* also suggests a late date. Here for the first time jealousy and holiness together are understood as attributes of God's nature, with the result being a kind of jealous holiness.[56]

Nah. 1:2 belongs to a secondary framework surrounding the core text in 1:3b-5; it resumes in v. 5. The intent of the theophany described is eschatological; it envisions a cosmic judgment. The text uses *qannô'* as a synonym of *nōqēm,* qualified further by *ḥēmâ* and *nôṭēr.*[57]

2. *Yahweh's Jealousy.* All four texts that use the hiphil express causation with reference to jealousy in the context of the great commandment: by *(bᵉ)* worshiping other gods or idols, Israel made God jealous. In Dt. 32:16 and 21 the parallelism with → **כעס**

---

50. *Ibid.,* 85.

51. Hossfeld, *Dekalog,* 45, 24.

52. C. Dohmen, *Das Bilderverbot. BBB* 62 (²1987), 215-16, 229-30.

53. D. Knapp, *Deuteronomium 4. GTA* 35 (1987), 81.

54. A. H. D. Mayes, *Deuteronomy. NCBC,* 175.

55. Cf. H. Mölle, *Der sogenannte Landtag zu Sichem. FzB* 42 (1980), 69-70, 281, who thinks, however, of the fall of the northern kingdom and the experience of the preexilic Deuteronomist.

56. Cf. von Rad, *OT Theology,* I, 203-4; W. H. Schmidt, *TRE,* XIII, 616-17.

57. H. Schulz, *Das Buch Nahum. BZAW* 129 (1973), 9-11.

kā'as shows that we are dealing with a late Dtr text.[58] V. 16 already refuses to call the objects of worship deities. V. 17 echoes the terminology of Deutero-Isaiah (Isa. 41:21-29; 43:10ff.; 44:9-20). V. 21 transforms the "covenant formulary" into its opposite. The context would lead us to expect *qn'* hiphil in v. 21a;[59] but usage of the text anticipates the transition to Middle Hebrew, where *qn'* piel can also be used for "make jealous." More likely, however, we are dealing with the factitive sense of the piel.[60] The semantic and thematic similarity of 1 K. 14:22 suggests the same usage.[61]

Also comparable is Ps. 78:58;[62] the use of Chronistic terminology (e.g., *nāšaq* [v. 9]) points to the postexilic period. The object of *qn'* is not other gods but only their idols.[63]

In Ezk. 8:3 and 5 the nature of the object that arouses God's jealousy is disputed. The construct phrase using → סמל *semel* as *nomen rectum* with *haqqin'â* is usually translated as "image of jealousy." Renaud has pointed out the possibility that we may be dealing here with the root *uqnû,* "lapis lazuli," attested in Ugaritic, Akkadian, and Syriac;[64] this root is used in genitive phrases with *ṣlm* [65] for statues of gods made of lapis lazuli. In this case the object of the polemic is a foreign cult object, which, positioned at the entrance to the temple of Yahweh, arouses Yahweh's jealousy.[66]

3. *Yahweh's Zeal.* The course of development established by the occurrences of the adjective is confirmed by the usage of the piel and the noun: in the late preexilic period and in the early exilic period the focus is on Israel's unfaithfulness, which arouses Yahweh's jealous anger. For example, Ezekiel can draw on the Hoseanic terminology of unfaithfulness by ascribing Yahweh's jealousy (16:38,42; 23:25) to the lewd behavior *(zimmâ)* of the woman who commits adultery *(zānâ)* and uncovers her nakedness *(glh 'erwâ)* to her lovers. The phrase *šōpᵉḵōṯ dām* (16:38aβ; cf. 23:45) comes from a secondary verbal association (the expression does not appear in LXX) with *dām* in the description of the punishment, referring to two groups to be punished with death. But since murderesses do not play a role anywhere else in the context, there is no point to Bernhardt's argument against translating *qn'* as "jealous" on the grounds that this translation makes no sense with reference to murderesses.[67] The singular construction in Nu. 25:11 has to do with the conduct of an individual representing Yahweh's interests: like Joshua's zeal on behalf of Moses (Nu. 11:29), Phinehas's zeal on behalf of Yahweh realizes Yahweh's own jealousy (v. 11bβ, synonymous with *ḥēmâ* in v. 11a), which otherwise would have consumed (*klh* piel) all Israel.

---

58. Knapp, *Deuteronomium 4,* 83-84.
59. Berg, 203.
60. *HP,* 270-71.
61. Renaud, 270 n. 3.
62. *Ibid.,* 69-70.
63. → פסל *pesel.*
64. Renaud, 154ff.
65. → עלם *'ālam.*
66. On the discussion of Ezk. 8:3-5, see S. Schroer, *In Israel gab es Bilder. OBO* 74 (1987), 26ff., and the review by C. Dohmen, *TRev* 84 (1988) 104.
67. Bernhardt, 92.

Zeph. 1:18 and 3:8 have their roots in the Sinai theophany, here transformed for the first time in a judgment theophany under the influence of *yôm yhwh* theology.[68] The secondary material in 1:18 and 3:8 comes from a late redaction interested in a universalistic eschatology.[69] Similar is Ps. 79 (postexilic), which interprets the experience of catastrophe (vv. 1-4) as a punishment and asks when God's blazing (*tiḇʿar kᵉmô-ʾēš,* v. 5) jealousy will end. Vv. 6-7 reinterpret this material: it is not Israel but the nations that deserved to be punished. Here we reach the final stage in the development of language concerning God's jealousy: God is understood as watching jealously/zealously over his people. Confident of this protective zeal, Isa. 9:6(7) looks forward to the messianic future.[70] Yahweh's zeal stands "behind the process of an epochal event"[71] (cf. Zec. 1:14; 8:2). The hope for restoration embodied in the notion of a sacred remnant to which God vouchsafes the future (2 K. 19:31; Isa. 37:32) reflects a late exilic and postexilic ideology.

Here the ambivalence of *qinʾâh* — passionate love or vitriolic hatred — is abrogated. God's zeal no longer targets Israel but Israel's enemies (cf. Ezk. 35:11; 36:5 [*lōʾ*],6); now Yahweh is zealous for his holy name (39:25), his land (Joel 2:18), Israel and Zion (Zec. 1:14; 8:2; Isa. 59:17), with a new emphasis on eschatological universalism (Isa. 63:15; Ezk. 38:19).[72]

IV. 1. *LXX and Vg.* Except in Ezk. 36:5 *(thymós)* and Prov. 14:30 *(kardía aisthētikḗ),* the LXX consistently translates *qn'* with *zḗlos* and its derivatives. The occurrences in secular contexts accord with general Greek usage: the meaning of *zḗlos* extends from "concentration on a (moral) goal" through "passionate emulation" to "destructive zeal" (contention).[73] As one might expect, there is no evidence for any theological meaning of *zḗlos* outside the LXX. In addition to the texts from the Hebrew Bible, in 1 Mc. 2:54,58, and Sir. 45:18,23; 48:2 the LXX provides occurrences that draw on earlier texts (Nu. 25:6-11 and 1 K. 19). Above all, "zeal for God" (cf. Jdt. 9:4) played a major historical role in the Zealot movement.[74]

The Vg. uses a variety of terms *(zelare, aemulari, invidere, zelotypia, provocare, conciliare, irritare, commotus)* to translate *qn'* and *zḗlos.*[75]

2. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* "Zeal for God" and God's commandments also dominates the occurrences in the Dead Sea Scrolls (1QS 9:23; 1QH 12:15; 12:14; 14:14). This zeal spurs the righteous psalmist to do battle with the wicked (1QH 9:14), but also represents a source of affliction (1QH 2:31; 9:2). But the scrolls also caution against zeal for

68. G. Krinetzki, *Zefanjastudien. RST* 7 (1977), 81-82.
69. Irsigler, *Psalm 73,* 112-13.
70. R. Kilian, *Jesaja 1–39. EdF* 200 (1983), 10.
71. W. Werner, *Eschatologische Texte in Jesaja 1–39. FzB* 46 (1982), 40.
72. Berg, 206.
73. Stumpff, 878-80.
74. M. Hengel, *Die Zeloten. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und Urchristentums* 1 (Leiden, 1961), esp. 151-234.
75. Bernhardt, 89.

the spirit of the wicked (1QS 10:19); wickedness and truth are locked in zealous combat (1QS 5:17). In addition to the quotation from Ex. 34:14 in 11QT 2:11,12, the zeal of God appears in 4Q400 fr. 1, 1:18; 4Q504 frs. 1-2, 3:11; 5:5; and 1QH 1:5.

Reuter

קָנָה *qānâ;* מִקְנֶה *miqneh;* מִקְנָה *miqnâ;* קִנְיָן *qinyān*

I. Verb: 1. "Acquire"; 2. "Beget, Bear"; 3. "Retain"; 4. *'ēl qōnēh 'āreṣ.* II. Nouns: 1. *qinyān;* 2. *miqnâ;* 3. *miqneh.*

I. Verb. The earlier lexicons cite a single root *qānâ* with the two meanings "acquire" and "create."[1] The verb *qny/w,* "acquire, possess," is widely attested in the Semitic languages: North Arabian, South Arabian, Ethiopic, Aramaic (cf. Ezr. 7:17),[2]

---

qānâ. Y. Aharoni, "Three Hebrew Ostraca from Arad," *BASOR* 197 (1970) 16-42, esp. 16-28; N. Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem* (Nashville, 1983), esp. 41; *idem,* "Excavations in the Jewish Quarter of the Old City of Jerusalem," *IEJ* 22 (1972) 193-200, esp. 195-96; J. Cantineau, "Tadmorea 31°: Un Poseidôn palmyrénien," *Syr* 19 (1938) 78-79; M. Dahood, "Northwest Semitic Notes on Genesis," *Bibl* 55 (1974) 76-82, esp. 77; H. Gese, in *idem,* M. Höfner, and K. Rudolph, *Die Religionen Altsyriens, Altarabiens und der Mandaer. RM* 10/2 (1970), 1-232, esp. 113-15; N. C. Habel, "'Yahweh, Maker of Heaven and Earth,'" *JBL* 91 (1972) 321-37; H. A. Hoffner, "The Elkunirsa Myth Reconsidered," *RHA* 23 (1965) 5-16; P. Humbert, "*Qânâ* en hébreu biblique," *FS A. Bertholet* (Tübingen, 1950), 259-66 = *Opuscules d'un hébraïsant* (1958), 166-74; H. Ingholt et al., *Recueil des tessères de Palmyre, BAH* 58 (1955), esp. nos. 220-23; A. Jirku, "Der kyprische Heros Kinyras und der syrische Gott Kinaru(m)," *FF* 37 (1963) 211; P. Katz, "The Meaning of the Root קנה," *JJS* 5 (1954) 126-31; S. Kirst, "Kinyras, König von Kypros, und El Schöpfer der Erde," *FF* 30 (1956) 185-89; E. Laroche, "Études sur les hiéroglyphes hittites, I," *Syr* 31 (1954) 99-117, esp. 99-103; A. Lemaire, "Une nouvelle cruche inscrite en paléo-hébreu," *Maarav* 2 (1979/80) 159-62, pls. 1-4; G. Levi della Vida, "El ʿElyôn in Genesis 14,18-20," *JBL* 63 (1944) 1-9; *idem,* "'El' padrone della terra," *RSO* 21 (1946) 246-47; *idem,* "Le iscrizioni neo-puniche della Tripolitania," *Libya* 3 (1927) 91-116, esp. 105ff.; *idem* and M. G. Amadasi Guzzo, *Iscrizioni puniche della Tripolitania (1927-1967)* (Rome, 1987), esp. no. 18 and 79; *idem,* "Tracce de credenze e culti fenici nelle iscrizioni neopuniche della Tripolitania," *FS J. Friedrich* (Heidelberg, 1959), 299-314, esp. 302ff., 310-11; E. Lipiński, *La royauté de Yahwé dans la poésie et le culte de l'ancien Israël* (Brussels, [2]1968), 418ff.; P. D. Miller, "El, Creator of Earth," *BASOR* 239 (1980) 43-46; T. Muraoka and A. Aḥuvyah, "לקח בהוראת 'קנה,'" *Leš* 36 (1971) 76-77; H. Otten, "Ein kanaanäischer Mythus aus Bogazköy," *MIO* 1 (1953) 125-50; W. H. Schmidt, "קנה *qnh* erwerben," *THAT,* II, 650-59; B. Uffenheimer, "El Elyon, Creator of Heaven and Earth" [Heb.], *Shnaton* 2 (1977) 20-26; F. Vattioni, "Note sul Genesi (Gen 14,17-24; 21,33)," *Aug* 12 (1972) 557-63; B. Vawter, "Prov. 8,22," *JBL* 99 (1980) 205-16; M. Weippert, "Elemente phönikischer und kilikischer Religion in den Inschriften von Karatepe," *ZDMG Sup* I/1 (1969), 191-217, esp. 203-4.

1. E.g., *GesB.*
2. Beyer, 684.

Neo-Assyrian,[3] Hebrew — in other words, throughout the entire Semitic-speaking world. The meaning "retain" appears in Old Babylonian, Ugaritic, and Aramaic. In addition, the verb can refer to the conception of a child; in this context it means "beget, bring into the world." This usage is attested in South Arabian inscriptions, Ugaritic, Hebrew, and Amorite onomastics. The meaning "create," instead, would be attested only in the West Semitic DN *'ēl qōneh* (Gen. 14:19,22) and in the Arabic lexicon *al-Qāmūs*,[4] where it refers to a human being created by God. But this Arabic parallel is suspicious, since the reference might be to a "slave *(qinn)* of God," as suggested by the Safaitic PN *qn'l(h)*, well attested in North Arabian.[5] If the name should in fact contain the perfect of the verb *qny/w*, it would appear in the form *qny'l* or *qnw'l*, which is never the case. The meaning "create" is consequently to be rejected. Furthermore, a statistical survey shows that of 83 occurrences of *qānâ* in the OT, only 4 imply the meaning "beget" or "bring into the world" (Gen. 4:1; Dt. 32:6; Ps. 139:13; Prov. 8:22); 2 more (Gen. 14:19,22) may imply the meaning "create." None of the nouns derived from *qānâ (qinyān, miqnâ, miqneh)* ever refers to conception or creation.

1. *"Acquire."* Apart from the six texts mentioned above, the primary usage of the verb *qānâ* is concrete and economic, and remains so through the last period of spoken Hebrew, as a contract from Murabbaʿat proves (Mur 30:23). The verb *qānâ* refers to the acquisition of chattels or real estate and therefore functions as the antonym of → מכר *māḵar*, "sell" (Gen. 47:19-20; Lev. 25:14-15,28,30,50; Dt. 28:68; Isa. 24:2; Ezk. 7:12; Zec. 11:5; Prov. 23:23). Often it refers to real estate: a field, a vineyard, a piece of land, a house (Gen. 25:10; 33:19; 49:30; 50:13; Lev. 25:28,30; 27:24; Josh. 24:32; 2 S. 24:21,24 [3 times]; 1 K. 16:24; Jer. 32:7[twice],8,9,15,25,43-44; Ruth 4:4-5,8; Neh. 5:16; 1 Ch. 21:24 [twice]). Elsewhere it is used for the ransom of a prisoner (Neh. 5:8), the purchase of a wife (Ruth 4:5,10), a slave (Gen. 39:1; 47:19-20,22-23; Ex. 21:2; Lev. 22:11; 25:44-45,50; Dt. 28:68; Am. 8:6; Zec. 13:5; Eccl. 2:7), livestock (2 S. 12:3; 24:24; Isa. 1:3; Zec. 11:5), timber and quarried stone (2 K. 12:13[12]; 22:6; 2 Ch. 34:11), a loincloth (Jer. 13:1,4), a jug (Jer. 19:1), spices (Isa. 43:24), or unspecified property (probably land: Lev. 25:14-15; Ruth 4:9).

In the book of Proverbs, proverbial wisdom transfers the use of *qānâ* to the intellectual realm, representing the acquisition of wisdom or insight as a profitable transaction (Prov. 1:5; 4:5,7; 15:32; 16:16; 17:16; 18:15; 19:8; 23:23). Finally, a few poetic passages describe Yahweh as acquiring Israel (Ex. 15:16; Isa. 11:11; Ps. 74:2; 78:54).

In several texts *qānâ* means explicitly to "acquire" by monetary payment (Gen. 33:19; Lev. 22:11; Josh. 24:32; 2 S. 24:24; 1 K. 16:24; Isa. 43:24; Jer. 32:9,25,44; 1 Ch. 21:24) or some other form of compensation (Gen. 47:19-20; Prov. 4:7) — in other words, "buy." This commercial meaning is merely a specialized nuance that the context adds to the primary meaning, which is simply "take possession of something."

---

3. *AHw*, II, 898; *CAD*, Q, 91.
4. Cited by G. W. Freytag, *Lexicon Arabico-Latinum* (Halle, 1830-37), s.v.
5. G. L. Harding, *An Index and Concordance of Pre-Islamic Arabian Names and Inscriptions* (Toronto, 1971), 489.

In the OT *qānâ* occurs only twice in the niphal (Jer. 32:15,43), and the two occurrences of the hiphil (Ezk. 8:3; Zec. 13:5) are highly dubious. In Post-Biblical Hebrew, however, the hiphil is common, and idiomatic usage distinguished very early between acquirer (*qōneh,* qal act. ptcp.) and possessor, owner (*maqneh,* hiphil ptcp.). This use of the hiphil participle is found not only in the Talmud[6] but already in the Dead Sea Scrolls, where the *maqnê hôn* (1QS 11:2) are "possessors of wealth." It can also be traced back to the 7th century B.C.E. in the PN *mqnyhw,* which appears on a seal and on two ostraca from Arad, as well as in its variant *mqnyw.*[7] The last name means "Yahweh is the owner," as its original pronunciation was probably *maqnēyāhû,* even in 1 Ch. 15:18,21, where *Ma-* is suggested by the LXX transcription *Makenia* (< *Makneia*). The MT vocalization *miqnēyāhû* is probably secondary, influenced by the noun *miqneh.* The parallel name *mqnmlk,* found on an Ammonite seal from the 7th century,[8] consequently means "the king is the owner."

2. *"Beget, Bear."* If analysis of the biblical texts raises doubts as to whether a single root can be used with two meanings as different as "acquire" and "beget," the South Arabian use of *qny* eliminates any uncertainty by demonstrating the existence of a semantic shift that justifies including the two different meanings of *qānâ* under a single root. The usual meaning of *qny* is "acquire,"[9] but some texts use this verb to denote the begetting of a child. In a Sabaean votive inscription,[10] the two husbands of a woman named Śāfnašr thank the god Almaqah because "they have (be)gotten healthy children" *(bkn yqnynn 'wldm 'ḏkrm hn'n),* and they praise him because "they have (be)gotten five boys and a girl with their wife Śāfnašr" *(qnyw ḫmšt ǵlmm wmr'tm bn 'nṯthmw śpnšr).* Another text[11] also speaks of "(be)getting healthy male children" *(bqn[y 'w]ldm 'ḏkrm hn'n).* In modern South Arabian dialects, this same root has acquired the meaning of "bringing up" children. Thus the use of *qny* in South Arabian shows that, while the basic meaning of *qānâ* is "become possessor of" or "acquire," it can also be used in the sense of "(be)getting" children when the context suggests this nuance: "acquiring something not previously possessed which may be done by buying or making it, in the case of a child by begetting it."[12]

The meaning "beget" for *qny* is likewise attested in Ugaritic. In a text Keret voices his desire to have children: [. . . *b*]*nm 'qny,* "would that I could (be)get sons!"[13] Elsewhere the ptcp. *qnyn* means "our begetter,"[14] and the epithet *qnyt ỉlm* of the goddess Athirat describes her as "bearer of gods."[15]

---

6. Bab. *B. Meṣi'a* 33b,47a.
7. On the seal see F. Vattioni, *Bibl* 50 (1969) 376, no. 162. On the ostraca see nos. 60.4 and 72.1. On *mqnyw* see *AION* 38 (1978) 238, no. 272.
8. *AION* 38 (1978) 242, no. 318.
9. Beeston, 106.
10. W. W. Müller, *NESE* 2 (1974), 125, ll. 3-5.
11. Jamme, 642.12-13.
12. C. F. Burney, *JTS* 27 (1926) 162; cf. H. Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom* (Lund, 1947), 101.
13. *KTU,* 1.14, II, 4.
14. *KTU,* 1.10, III, 5.
15. *KTU,* 1.4, I, 22; III, 26, 30, 35; IV, 32.

In Amorite onomastics the proper name *qa-ni-a-tum* characterizes a woman as "genetrix"; *yiqniyum,* the name of another woman, may derive from a PN like *yaqniy-el,* "El/God has begotten," which reappears as a theophorous element in the Ugar. PN *yaqniy (ia-aq-ni).*[16] Later equivalents of these names include *'elqānâ* (Ex. 6:24; 1 S. 1:4,8,19,21,23; 2:11,20; 1 Ch. 6:8,10-12,19-21; 9:16; 12:7[6]; 15:23; 2 Ch. 28:7), *el-qa-na-a,* and *qa-na-a-el*[17] = *qn'l,*[18] where the *qṭl* form has taken over the function of the earlier *yqṭl.* We also find analogous names with other theophorous elements, such as *nabû-qa-na-a'* and *šamaš-qa-na-a,*[19] in which the verb *qānâ* probably alludes to the birth of the child bearing the name. In Mesopotamia, where these names are found, a personal name with the theophorous element Nabu or Shamash generally serves as a reminder that the child is a gift of the deity.

In the OT only four texts use *qānâ* in the sense of "(be)getting" a child: Dt. 32:6; Ps. 139:13; Prov. 8:22; Gen. 4:1b. Dt. 32:6 likens Yahweh to a father, who "begot" Israel, while Ps. 139:13 sees in him a personal God who "begot" his child in the mother's womb. The personal names like *'elqānâ* cited above may also allude to divine participation in the conception of a child. In Prov. 8:22 personified Wisdom, speaking in hymnic style, proclaims that God "begot" her and that she "was brought forth" (*ḥôlaltî,* vv. 24-25) before anything else existed. This meaning of *qānâ* conforms to the usage of the verb in Ugaritic; and its use with a feminine subject, attested in Ugaritic, appears in Gen. 4:1b, where Eve declares: *qānîṯî 'îš 'eṯ-yhwh,* "I have brought a man into the world with Yahweh." Here the biblical redactor may have employed a statement originally uttered by a mother goddess, comparable to a passage in the Chaldean cosmogony that describes Aruru as creating the human race with Marduk: "With him Aruru created the seed of humanity."[20] This must not be taken to mean that humanity issues from the (sexual) union of the god and the goddess: Aruru forms a human figure from clay, and Marduk breathes life into its soul. But the verb *qānâ* in Gen. 4:1b does not appear to carry this meaning. The author or redactor of 4:1 is indeed thinking of sexual union, as the first half of the verse shows; it is therefore likely that the biblical narrative incorporates the tradition of a *hieros gamos* that produces the human race.

3. *"Retain."* Old Bab. *qanû* means "keep, retain." A letter, possibly sent from Mishrife-Qatna in Syria, contains the sentence: *amtam ša ēzibakkum la taqannīši ana kaspim idinši,* "do not keep the slave I entrust to you, but sell her."[21] A letter from Mari cites a command of King Shamshi-Adad I: *ana pūḫāt wattarī* [*taq*]*annû,* "you are to keep them as a reserve."[22] The same meaning of *qny* is found in an Aramaic

---

16. On the first two names see *ARM,* XVI/1, 127. On *yaqnih-el* see *CT,* XLV, no. 91, I, 10. On Ugar. *yaqniy* see *Ugaritica* V, 13, no. 9, 5.
17. *APN,* 99, 183a.
18. *CIS,* I, 135.5.
19. See, respectively, K. Tallqvist, *Neubabylonische Namenbuch* (1905), 142; *APN,* 212.
20. *AOT,* 130-31.
21. *AbB,* II, no. 177, 18-20.
22. *ARM,* IV, no. 86, 33-34.

document from Naḥal Ḥever: *rš'yn zbny' dy mn'l' b'tr' dk wyrthn lmqnh wlmzbnh,* "the aforementioned purchasers and their heirs have the right to retain or sell this plot."[23] It also seems to appear in Ugaritic: *tṣḥqaynt wblb tqny,* "'Anat laughs and keeps in [her] heart."[24] The meaning "keep" or "accept" has also been assigned to *qny* in *mrzḥ d qny šmmn b bt,*[25] "the table society that Shamumānu accepted in his house" — by providing a room for its members and obligating himself to pay 50 shekels should he expel them. This clause seems to indicate that the society was not a personal institution or creation of Shamumānu; therefore *qny* should not be translated "established" or "created." It is also hard to decide between the two semantic nuances in the expression *il d yqny ḏdm,* "El, who keeps/owns the pastures."[26]

4. *'ēl qōnēh 'āreṣ.* This meaning of *qānâ* is also found in Gen. 14:19,22, only with the difference that the object is the "earth" rather than the "pastures." The ptcp. *qōneh* in these verses is often erroneously and anachronistically translated "creator," although the text refers simply to the "proprietor." The "metaphysical" interpretation comes from the LXX and the paraphrase in Jdt. 13:18, whose origin must be sought in some such expression as *bôrē' (haš)šāmayim,* "creator of the heavens" (Isa. 42:5; 45:18; 65:17). Contrariwise, in Gen. 14:19,22, Tg. Onq. translates *qōneh* with *deqinyānēh,* "whose property are heaven and earth." But the correct interpretation of this section is already found in 1QapGen 22:16,21, where *qōneh* is represented by *mr',* "Lord of heaven and earth." The evidence is highly valuable, since the date of 1QapGen (ca. 100 B.C.E.) is relatively close to the redaction of Gen. 14, where the ptcp. *qōneh* must mean simply "owner," as in Lev. 25:28,50 (cf. Isa. 1:3, where *ba'al,* "master," parallels *qōneh*). In this meaning the ptcp. *qōneh* appears to be synonymous with *maqneh.*

The relatively late acceptance of "El, owner of the earth," by the cult of Yahweh is of great theological interest. This divine appellative appears in the compound expression *'ēl 'elyôn qōnēh šāmayim wā'āreṣ* (Gen. 14:19,22); it is glossed in Jdt. 13:18 and translated correctly in 1QapGen 22:16,21 as *'l 'lywn mrh šmy' w'r,* "El Elyon, Lord of heaven and earth." It presupposes the identification of El with → עליון *'elyôn,* who are still distinct figures on the Sefire stele,[27] and their coalescence with Yahweh. A similar phenomenon is illustrated by Hatra inscription 23.3,[28] where the Baal of Heaven *(b'lšmyn)* is described as "owner of the earth" (*qnh dy r'* [the omission of the *aleph* in *'r'* is not unusual]). This epithet, transcribed as *Konnaros,* also appears to stand by itself in two inscriptions from Baalbek, one in Latin and one in Greek.[29] The West Semitic inscriptions demonstrate that the original divine appellative was *'ēl*

23. Beyer, 332, V, 46.9.
24. *KTU,* 1.17, VI, 41.
25. *KTU,* 3.9, 1-4.
26. *KTU,* 1.19, IV, 57-58. Cf. OSA *ḏwd,* Beeston, 40.
27. I.A.11; *KAI,* no. 222 = *TSSI,* II, no. 7.
28. A. Caquot, *Syr* 29 (1952) 102-3; 40 (1963) 15.
29. *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie* VI (Paris, 1986), nos. 2743, 2841.

qōnēh 'āreṣ; a myth from northern Syria, extant in a Hittite version,[30] bears witness to the cult of this deity in the 2d millennium B.C.E. The Hittite text from Boghazköy, written ca. 1200 B.C.E., speaks of a god *ᵈEl-ku-ni-ir-ša,* the consort of the goddess Ashertu; this could be none other than *'ēl qōniy 'arṣa,* "El, owner of the earth" (Sem. *ṣ* < *ḏ* is represented in Hittite by a cuneiform sign transcribed with *š*). In the 8th century the bilingual (Phoenician and Luwian) texts from Karatepe speak of *'l qn 'rṣ* and identify him with the Mesopotamian god Ea, who was familiar in the Syrian and Anatolian west.[31] The same divine appellative appears nine centuries later in a Neo-Punic inscription from Leptis Magna,[32] which can be dated in the 2d century B.C.E. It speaks of dedication *l'dn l'l qn 'rṣ,* "to the lord, to El, owner of the earth." Finally, at Palmyra the divine appellative appears in the aramaized form *'lq(w)nr'* on at least four tesserae and in a bilingual (Greek and Palmyrene) text where dedication *[l]'lqwnr' 'lh' ṭb',* "to El, owner of the earth, the good god," corresponds to Gk. *Poseidōni theō,* "to the god Poseidon."[33] The identification of the Semitic deity with the Greek god Poseidon is probably explained by the latter's "Homeric" epithet *gaiḗochos,* "carrier of the earth, he who surrounds the earth, lord of the earth." On the other hand, the name Kinyras, borne by a legendary Cypriote king, has nothing to do with the epithet *qn 'rṣ;* and the words [ ]*qn 'rṣ* on an ostracon discovered at Jerusalem and dating from the 7th century B.C.E. can be interpreted in a secular sense as "purchaser of a plot of land," or (better) read as [*z*]*qn 'rṣ,* "an elder of the land" (cf. Gen. 50:7; 1 K. 20:7; Jer. 26:17; Prov. 31:23).[34] Furthermore, in Hebrew one would expect the word to be written as *qnh* rather than *qn.*

The divine appellative by itself does not tell us anything about the nature of El's property rights or the act that brought him into possession of the earth. His domain must have originally contrasted with the heavens, which were under the sway of the god of the atmosphere and storms, and the sea, which appeared as a third divine principle. This tripartite division of the world, presupposed in Gen. 1:7-10, derives from a cosmogonic myth.

The ptcp. *qōneh* or *qāniy* also appears in Hebrew and Aramaic personal names. The PN *q(w)nyh* or *qnyw* and its short forms *qwn, qny, qu-ni-i,* and Aram. *qa-ni-e* or *qny',* can be interpreted either as "Yahweh is the owner" or "Yahweh is the begetter";[35] the former interpretation is supported by the Ugaritic parallel *qnmlk,* "the king is the owner,"[36] as well as by the previously cited PNs *mqnmlk* and *mqny(h)w.*

30. *ANET*³, 519.

31. *KAI,* 26.A.III.18 = *TSSI* III, 15A, III, 18.

32. *KAI,* 129.

33. For the former see *RT,* nos. 220-23; for the latter see Cantineau.

34. Avigad, 195-96.

35. *q(w)nyh: AP,* 1.2; 5.2,8,11,15,20; 6.8; 8.6; *qnyw: AION* 38 (1978) 361, no. 13; *qwn: AP,* 22.117; 67, no. 4, l. 2; *qny:* Lemaire, 161; *qu-ni-i: APN,* 184; and Aram. *qa-ni-e:* J. N. Strassmaier, *Inschriften von Nabonidus,* no. 360.3; *qny': AP,* 63.14.

36. *KTU,* 4.6, I, 21.

II. Nouns. The nouns derived from the root *qānâ* are distributed as follows: *qinyān,* 10 occurrences; *miqnâ,* 15 occurrences; *miqneh,* 74 occurrences.

1. *qinyān.* The noun *qinyān* always refers to wealth: personal property (explicitly distinguished from livestock [*miqneh*] in Gen. 31:18; 34:23; 36:6; Josh. 14:4; Ezk. 38:12-13; and from cattle [*bᵉhēmâ*] in Gen. 34:23; 36:6), money (Lev. 22:11), or wealth in general (Ps. 105:21; Prov. 4:7). Ps. 104:24 identifies God's works with the wealth (MT sg.: *qinyāne̱kā;* variants pl.; see NRSV "creatures") with which God has filled the earth. It is also possible that Zec. 13:5 should be read *ʾᵃḏāmâ qinyānî,* "the land is my possession," rather than *ʾāḏām hiqnanî;* this reading is supported by the frequent appearance of *qinyān* in the OT. The noun appears in the Dead Sea Scrolls with the same meaning, and it is distinguished explicitly from *miqneh,* "livestock" (1QH 10:25).

2. *miqnâ.* In Jer. 32:11-12,14,16, the noun *miqnâ* refers to a "deed of purchase" *(sēp̱er hammiqnâ);* in Gen. 17:12-13,23,27; Ex. 12:44; Lev. 25:16,51, it refers to a "purchase price" *(miqnaṯ kesep).* This may also be the case in Gen. 23:18, where Ephron's field passes to Abraham "for the price" of 400 shekels of silver (v. 16). Only in Lev. 27:22 does *miqnâ* have the abstract meaning "purchase" — and probably also in Gen. 49:32, where *miqneh* should be emended to *miqnâ:* "That is a purchase — the field and the cave that is in it — from the Hittites" (cf. Gen. 23:20). This emendation changes the statistics given above to 16 occurrences of *miqnâ* and 73 of *miqneh.*

3. *miqneh.* The meaning of *miqneh* is always concrete; it always denotes livestock in general (Gen. 47:17-18; Ex. 9:3,19; 1 Ch. 5:21; Job 1:3), including pack animals, cattle, sheep, and goats (Gen. 26:14; Ex. 10:26; 12:38; 34:19; 1 S. 30:20; 2 Ch. 32:29; Eccl. 2:7). Sometimes it refers only to sheep and goats (Nu. 32:16) or is distinguished from cattle (*bᵉhēmâ:* Gen. 34:23; 36:6; 47:18[LXX]; Nu. 31:9; 32:26; 2 K. 3:17) or camels (Jer. 49:32). It has the same meaning in the Dead Sea Scrolls (1QM 12:12; [19:4]; 1QH 10:25). This form of property is distinguished clearly from money (Gen. 13:2; 47:18), slaves (Gen. 26:14; Ex. 9:20-21), and wealth (*qinyān:* Gen. 31:18; 34:23; 36:6; Josh. 14:4; Ezk. 38:12-13; 1QH 10:25; *rᵉḵûš,* Gen. 31:18).

It is noteworthy that this noun has the same meaning in Old Aramaic, Phoenician, and Punic. In Sefire inscription I (B, 27),[37] *mqny* (with the 1st-person sg. pronominal suf.) contrasts with "earth": *qyqḥ mn ʾrqy ʾw mn mqny,* "and he took from my land or my livestock." In the sacrificial tariffs from Carthage, the word appears in the absolute as *mqnʾ,* but there can be no question that we are dealing with the same term. Here it refers globally to cattle, sheep, and goats, as distinct from fowl.[38] The Neo-Punic inscription from Bir Tlelsa mentions an "altar for livestock" *(hmzbḥ š hmqnt),* a sacrificial offering distinguished explicitly from offerings of grain and incense.[39] The spelling *mqnt*

37. *KAI,* no. 222 = *TSSI,* II, no. 7.
38. *KAI,* 69.15; 74.6-7.
39. *KAI,* 138.3.

in this text may be due to confusion with the Punic word corresponding to Heb. *miqnâ,* which is found in a funerary inscription: *[q]b'r mqn't 'tm',* "tomb at full purchase price."[40]

If we retain the Masoretic vocalization of the name *miqnēyāhû* in 1 Ch. 15:18,21, the PNs *mqny(h)w* and *mqnmlk*[41] must be translated "livestock of Yahweh" and "livestock of the king," respectively. This translation is defensible on the grounds that people are often called the "sheep" *(ṣō'n)* of Yahweh (Jer. 23:1; Ezk. 34:31; Mic. 7:14; Ps. 74:1; 95:7; 100:3; 11QPs[a] 28:3-4). It is even possible to suppose that the names *q(w)nyh/'* and *qny(w)* do not derive from the root *qny* but are Aramaic names having something to do with *qn,* "sheep." This theory is ruled out, however, by the fact that *qn* was pronounced *qān* (cf. *qa-ni*[42]), which cannot be reconciled with the plene writing of the PNs *qwnyh, qwn,* and *qu-ni-i.*

Lipiński

40. Tripolitana 79.1.
41. See I.1 above.
42. *BAfO* 6 (1940 = 1967), no. 106.12.

קָנֶה *qāneh;* קָנָה *qānâ*

I. 1. Etymology; 2. General. II. OT: 1. Flora; 2. Measurement; 3. *m[e]nôrâ;* 4. Upper Arm; 5. Toponym. III. LXX. IV. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. 1. *Etymology.* Biblical Heb. *qāneh* is a primary noun[1] with isoglosses in Akkadian and Ugaritic, where it appears with a range of meanings comparable to that found in Biblical Hebrew. The basic meaning in each case is something "tubular" (or better, an actual "tube"). Akk. *qanû(m)* is found with the meanings "(pieces of) wood," "reed,"

qāneh. T. A. Busink, *Der Tempel von Jerusalem,* 2 vols. (Leiden, 1970-80), esp. I, 293-99; II, 1156-72; M. Copisarow, "The Ancient Egyptian, Greek and Hebrew Concept of the Red Sea," *VT* 12 (1962) 1-13; R. Germer, "Schilf," *LexÄg,* V, 628-29; I. Löw, *Die Flora der Juden,* I (Hildesheim, 1967), esp. 662-85; C. L. Meyers, *The Tabernacle Menorah. ASORDS* 2 (1976), esp. 19-20; H. N. and A. L. Moldenke, *Plants of the Bible* (Waltham, 1952); F. V. Reiterer, "Das geknickte Rohr zerbricht er nicht," *Heiliger Dienst* 35 (1981) 162-84; L. Rodewald-Rudescu, *Das Schilfrohr, Die Binnengewässer,* 27 (Stuttgart, 1974); H. J. Spitz, "Schilfrohr und Binse als Sinnträger in der lateinischen Bibelexegese," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 12 (1978) 230-57; M. Zohary, *Plants of the Bible* (Eng. trans. London, 1982).

1. *HAL,* III, 1113.

and "sacrificial offering." In compounds we find *qan-šalālum,* "kind of reed" or "drug," and *qanû ṭābu,* "sweet cane" (also "drug") or "reed pen." The word can also mean "arrow" or "shaft," "wind instrument," "small stone or metal tube," and "measuring rod." This last sense gives rise in turn to the meaning "unit of measurement," specifically a unit of length, "rod" (6 cubits), or a unit of area, "square rod" (49 square cubits).[2]

In Ugaritic, too, the basic meaning is something "tubular":[3] *qn drʿ,* "arm pipe, upper arm";[4] also "food pipe, throat,"[5] and "aromatic cane."[6] We find *qnm* with the meaning "reeds from broad marshes, rushes"[7] and "reed arrow."[8]

Among the later Northwest Semitic dialects, Pun. *qnʾ zkʾ* means "aromatic cane" (cf. Ex. 30:23; Jer. 6:20).[9] Neo-Punic *qnm* is uncertain.[10] In Aramaic we find *qᵉnāʾ,* "reed, rush, stalk"; to "reed, stalk," Jewish Aram. *qanyāʾ* adds the meaning "measuring rod." Christian Palestinian *qnyʾ,* Mand. *qaina,* and Syr. *qanyā* mean "reed" or "stalk."[11] This meaning is also attested in South Semitic (Arab. *qanāh;* also "spear, lance, shaft"[12]). Middle Hebrew continues the meanings found in the OT and adds further derivatives, all of which, however, convey the basic sense of something "tubular."[13]

2. *General.* Within the OT and in subsequent usage, the lexical field of *qāneh* is extremely broad. It extends from "stalk, marsh plant, aromatic plant" through "unit of measure, surveying rod," to "branches" (of the *mᵉnôrâ*). In the botanical realm the OT also uses *ʾᵃgām, ʾagmōn/ʾagmôn,* and *gōmeʾ* for specific marsh plants. Outside the OT *qāneh* appears in Greek as a loanword: *kánna, kanṓn,* "measure."[14] From this Greek usage there evolved the comprehensive term for what is ecclesiastically normative with respect to doctrine and the life of the church. In the 4th century the term came to be applied to the books of the Bible (OT and NT) collectively and came into use in Latin. In the Christian world this resulted in the use of "canon" as a technical term for the inspired Scriptures.

Syntactically, *qāneh* functions in construct phrases as *nomen regens* (*qᵉnēh hammiddâ* [esp. Ezk. 40–42], *qᵉnê mᵉnôrâ* [esp. Ex. 25 par. 37], *qᵉnēh-ḇōśem* [Ex. 30:23]) and as *nomen rectum* (*mišʿeneṯ qāneh/haqqāneh* [2 K. 18:21; Isa. 36:6; Ezk. 29:6], *ḥayyaṯ qāneh* [Ps. 68:31(Eng. 30)], *mᵉlô haqqāneh* [Ezk. 41:8], *sēṯer qāneh* [Job 40:21], with a numeral: *šᵉnê haqqānîm* [Ex. 25:35; 37:21 (3 times each)]). In addition,

---

2. *AHw,* II, 898; cf. *CAD,* Q, 85-91.
3. *WUS,* no. 2324; *UT,* nos. 2244-45.
4. *KTU,* 1.5, VI, 20; 1.6, I, 4; see II.4 below.
5. *KTU,* 1.6, II, 23; cf. M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *UF* 17 (1985) 109-10; *KTU,* 1.4, VIII, 20.
6. *KTU,* 1.4, VIII, 20; 4.91, 10; 4.158, 12; 4.247, 19.
7. *KTU,* 1.17, VI, 23; cf. M. Dijkstra and J. C. de Moor, *UF* 7 (1975) 186; J. Sanmartín, *UF* 9 (1977) 373.
8. *KTU,* 1.17, VI, 9; cf. Dijkstra and de Moor, *UF* 7 (1975) 185.
9. *DISO,* 259. See II.1.c below.
10. *KAI,* 161.8.
11. *HAL,* III, 1113; *MdD,* 400; *LexSyr,* 677.
12. Wehr, 794.
13. *WTM,* IV, 334-35, 337, 342-43.
14. H. W. Beyer, "κανών," *TDNT,* III, 596-602.

qāneh often appears with numerals, which either follow as attributive adjectives (*qāneh 'eḥāḏ* [Gen. 41:5,22; several times in Ezk. 40], *haqqāneh hā'eḥāḏ* [Ex. 25:33; 37:19]) or precede in apposition with *qāneh* (e.g., *šiššâ qānîm* [25:32,33,35; 37:18,19,21], *šᵉlōšâ qānîm* [25:32; 37:18 (twice each)]).

II. OT.

1. *Flora.* a. *Stalk.* The earliest occurrences of *qāneh* are in Gen. 41:5,22 (E/JE). The Egyptian pharaoh dreams of seven fat cows and seven thin cows, as well as a single "stalk" *(qāneh)* bearing several ears. In this context *qāneh* is probably to be understood as a tubular stalk bearing multiple ears *(šibbᵒlîm).* There is no further information to indicate what kind of plant is envisioned. The context requires a plant that grows in Egypt, but there is no compelling reason to think of some kind of marsh plant, as other contexts assume. The stalk is merely described as bearing ears of grain.

b. *Marsh Plant.* Unlike Gen. 41:5 and 22, Job 40:21 (postexilic) clearly states the habitat where the *qāneh* grows. The hippopotamus *(bᵉhēmôṯ)* described in Job 40:15-24 as making its covert in the *qāneh* was probably native to the Nile. Here too *qāneh* denotes a plant, botanically a species of *Arundo* or *Phragmites;*[15] the OT speaks of it only in connection with Egypt,[16] although it also grows in Palestine, Syria, and on the Sinai Peninsula, as well as by the Dead Sea and in the Jordan Valley. We are probably dealing with a species of grass 6-10 feet high, with a hollow stem 2-3 inches in diameter crowned by narrow cylindrical tufts, with white blossoms and green leaves 12-30 inches long.[17] It is impossible to be more precise, since several species of reeds are native to the Near East and the contexts are not more specific. The variety described here is the commonest species in Israel.[18] These reeds together with another species of reed (→ סוּף *sûp,* Isa. 19:6) and rushes (*gōme',* 35:7; both texts are postexilic[19]) constitute the typical plant community of the Nile Delta. Isa. 35:7 (reading *ḥāṣēr* for MT *ḥāṣîr:* "an area for *qāneh* and *gōme'*" [contra NRSV][20]) makes clear that this region is very fertile, since 35:1-10 is a prophecy of salvation, and the author pictures the desert thus transformed into springs of water in the messianic age. Contrariwise, the prophecy of judgment against Egypt envisions the withering of the *qāneh* (19:6).

In this context the interpretation of Gen. 6:14 is uncertain. The consonantal text *qnym* is normally interpreted as *qinnîm,* "cells, chambers." This interpretation has been questioned, most recently by Strömberg Krantz, who reads *qānîm* as the plural of *qāneh* and interprets it as "material (= reeds) for caulking the seams."[21] In context this

---

15. Löw et al.
16. See Germer for a discussion of the various types of reeds and rushes found in Egypt.
17. Moldenke, 50.
18. Zohary, 134, with photograph.
19. But see the discussion of Isa. 19:6 by H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1997), 246.
20. With H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 2002), 341; and O. Kaiser, *Das Buch Jesaja 13–39. ATD* XVIII (²1976), 289.
21. E. Strömberg Krantz, *Des Schiffes Weg mitten in Meer. CBOT* 19 (1982), 171-73, with bibliog.

interpretation yields a logically coherent sequence of construction processes in vv. 13-15. Furthermore, she maintains, the caulking of ships is well attested in the ancient world. Following many others (including Philo), Westermann suggests the reading *qinnîm qinnîm,* "all kinds of rooms" (from → קֵן *qēn,* "nest").[22]

The noun *qāneh* referring to an aquatic plant is used figuratively in 1 K. 14:15 (late Dtr): Israel, smitten by Yahweh, is shaken (→ נוד *nûḏ*) like a *qāneh* in the water.

c. *Aromatic Plant.* In the OT the compounds *qᵉnēh-ḇōśem* (Ex. 30:23) and *qāneh (haṭ)ṭôḇ* (Jer. 6:20) as well as simple *qāneh* (Isa. 43:24; Ezk. 27:19; Cant. 4:14) also refer to a different plant, distinct from the one just discussed. We are dealing here with an aromatic cane or grass, more specifically ginger grass, which grows primarily in northwestern and central India (Jer. 6:20: "from a distant land"; Ezk. 27:19: listed among commercial goods) and was imported into Palestine via the so-called incense road. Here again we cannot identify the exact species with certainty; it is clear that one of these grasses also grows wild in Israel.[23] These grasses grow 3-5 feet tall and contain essential oils that can be extracted from the greens by steam distillation. Like the reeds described in the previous section, this aromatic plant grows in marshy regions.

The individual contexts (all exilic or postexilic) reveal the special qualities of *qāneh.* Ex. 30:22-33 contains instructions for making the holy anointing oil, which consists of "first-quality balsam" *(bᵉśāmîm rō'š),* "liquid myrrh" *(mor-dᵉrôr),* "sweet-smelling cinnamon" *(qinnᵉmôn-beśem),* and *qᵉnēh-ḇōśem* (v. 23) in prescribed quantities, mixed with a *hîn* (between 4 and 7 quarts?) of "olive oil" *(šemen zayiṯ,* v. 24). With it are anointed the tent of meeting *('ōhel mô'ēḏ)* and all its paraphernalia (vv. 26-28). Secular use of this anointing oil is forbidden.

Jer. 6:20 (Dtr) speaks of *qāneh* together with frankincense *(lᵉḇônâ)* from Sheba; this text treats it as one of the most precious (imported) sacrificial offerings for Yahweh. Isa. 43:24 speaks of fat *(ḥeleḇ)* as an offering in parallel with *qāneh.* Cant. 4:14 lists *qāneh* along with nard *(nērd),* calamus *(karkōm),* cinnamon *(qinnāmôn),* frankincense trees *('ᵃṣê lᵉḇônâ),* myrrh *(mōr),* and aloes *('ᵃhālôṯ)* — all aromatic plants that serve here purely as metaphors for the female. There were no such gardens in Palestine.

d. *Metaphorical Usage.* Since *qāneh* grows in marshy areas and is hollow, it withers and dies without water. The OT uses this phenomenon frequently and variously as a metaphor for vulnerability and fragility. In 2 K. 18:21 (Dtr) par. Isa. 36:6, Sennacherib's emissary calls Egypt the "broken reed" *(haqqāneh hārāṣûṣ)* that pierces the hand of anyone who tries to use it as a staff. This passage reflects distrust of Egypt as an unreliable ally during the reign of Hezekiah. Ezk. 29:6 later uses the same terminology to sound the theme of Egypt's unreliability, citing it as the reason for Egypt's destruction (vv. 1-16). Ps. 68:31(30) (postexilic) speaks of rebuking "the wild animal that lives among the reeds" (*ḥayyaṯ qāneh* = Egypt), envisioning the Nile as the source of *qāneh.* In Isa. 42:3 *qāneh rāṣûṣ* and the parallel "dimly burning wick" *(pištâ ḵēhâ)*

---

22. C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1984), 391.

23. Zohary, 196; for a more detailed description of the various species, see Moldenke, 40-41.

symbolize the sinfulness of the people of Israel,[24] whom the servant of God (Cyrus?) will not destroy totally but will restore, although this restoration of a "bruised and broken straw . . . will still be a fragile patchwork."[25]

2. *Measurement.* Reeds were among the plants used to make a wide range of implements; the ancient Greeks used reeds for arrows, pens, and measuring rods. The only such use of *qāneh* mentioned in the OT is for measurement.

Ezekiel's vision of the new temple (Ezk. 40–42) contains 20 occurrences of *qāneh.* The phrase *qᵉnēh hammiddâ*[26] denotes a measuring instrument and *qāneh 'eḥāḏ* a unit of measurement. Simple *qānîm* is also a unit of measurement. Literary analysis shows that *qāneh* belongs to the core stratum (Ezk. 40:1-37 . . .) and the first supplement (Ezk. 41:5-15a; 42:15-20 . . .), without any apparent semantic distinction.[27]

In Ezk. 40:3 a man holds a linen cord *(pᵉṯîl-pištîm)* and a measuring reed *(qᵉnēh hammiddâ)* in his hand; the former appears only here. The linen cord is used to measure long distances, the *qᵉnēh hammiddâ* short distances. (A third instrument appears in 47:3: *qāw,* a cord 30 cubits long.) This *qᵉnēh hammiddâ* measures 6 cubits *('ammôṯ),* more specifically 6 "long" cubits ("an ordinary cubit and a handbreadth" [40:5]; 2 Ch. 3:3 also speaks of "cubits of the old standard"), i.e., about 10 feet. The definite article suggests a fixed unit of length.[28] In contrast, all measurements of less or more than 6 cubits are indicated by *'ammôṯ* plus a numeral (40:7,9,11,12,13,15, etc.). This *qᵉnēh hammiddâ* is used to measure the wall around the temple (thickness [*rōḥaḇ*] and height [*qômâ*]: v. 5), the threshold of the east gate (v. 6), the recesses of the gate (length [*'ōreḵ*] and width [*rōḥaḇ*]: v. 7), the vestibule on the temple side of the gate (v. 8).[29] All these dimensions measure *qāneh 'eḥāḏ,* the length of the measuring reed discussed above.

In Ezk. 41:8 the dimensions of foundations of the side chambers are given quite precisely with "a full reed of six long cubits" *(mᵉlô* [mss. *mᵉlō'*] *haqqāneh šēš 'ammôṯ 'aṣṣîlâ).*

The description of the dimensions of the temple area (Ezk. 42:15-20) mentions both the measuring instrument *(bi)qnēh hammiddâ* used to measure the east, north, south, and west sides and the unit of length *qānîm.* Each side measures *ḥᵃmēš-mē'ôṯ* (500) *qānîm* (v. 16 *Q*). Since these *qānîm* have no equivalent in the LXX, they are probably a very late addition to the text. This addition was made "because the information to be found in all these verses, that the measurement was made בקנה המדה, was understood as an indication of the measurement and not simply as an indication of the measuring

---

24. For a survey of interpretations see K. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja. BK* XI/1 (1970), 210-14.
25. Reiterer, 174.
26. → מדד *māḏaḏ.*
27. → VIII, 125-26.
28. For a discussion of extrabiblical measuring implements, see E. D. van Buren, *ArOr* 17 (1949) 434-50.
29. On the various terms for "height," "width," etc., see H. Gese, *Der Verfassungsentwurf des Ezechiel. BHT* 25 (1957), 124ff.

instrument. This information is missing in v. 20, where then also the insertion of קנים did not take place. Here the original form of the text can be seen, according to which the measurement figures appeared originally without the addition of the unit of measurement."[30] Nevertheless, *qānîm* is not to be interpreted as a unit of measurement, "measuring reed(s)," (= 6 cubits), since that would make each side of the temple area 3,000 cubits long. Here *qāneh* must be interpreted as "cubit," making the temple area 500 cubits square.

The dimensions of the individual parts of the temple precincts are not visionary, as claimed by Ezk. 40:1-2, but are "the result of careful thought and precise calculation."[31]

Isa. 46:6 uses *qāneh* for a measuring instrument used to weigh silver *(šql kesep),* probably referring to the beam supporting the pans of a balance. This is the only passage in the OT where *qāneh* has this meaning, but this type of balance was familiar throughout the Semitic area.[32]

3. *m^enôrâ*. Ex. 25–31 gives instructions for the tabernacle and the cult; the execution of these instructions is described in Ex. 35–39. They include the making of a seven-branch lampstand[33] (25:31; 37:17) of pure gold. Ex. 25:31-40 par. 37:17-24 (using identical terminology) describe the appearance of *m^enôrâ* in great detail. (Redactionally, 25:31-37a can be assigned to P^G, vv. 37b-40 being an addition; 37:17-24 is a secondary complement to P^G.[34]) Its parts include "base and shaft" *(yārēḵ w^eqāneh,* 25:31; 37:17) and "six arms/branches" *(šiššâ qānîm,* 25:32,33,35; 37:18,19,21; the suffix of the form *qānôṯ* in 25:36 and 37:22, without change of meaning, is unusual), "three branches of the lampstand" *(š^elōšâ q^enê m^enôrâ,* 25:32; 37:18) attached to each side of the *m^enôrâ*. Decorative elements emerge from the base and shaft: calyxes *(g^eḇi'îm),* buds *(kaptōrîm),* and blossoms *(p^erāḥîm).*[35] According to 25:33-35; 37:19-21, each of the six arms bore three calyxes in the shape of almond blossoms, each with a bud and a blossom; on the shaft were four calyxes in the shape of almond blossoms, with buds and blossoms, one bud beneath each pair of branches. The use of *qāneh* to denote both the shaft of the *m^enôrâ* and the six branches is due to their tubular form. The expression *yārēḵ w^eqāneh* points "to a base-forming shaft, thickened or flaring outward toward the bottom, forming a stable, free-standing object. Such cultic stands are attested by archaeological evidence in the ancient Near East."[36] Probably even the appearance of the stand was influenced by Egyptian prototypes;[37] once again we see the association with *qāneh* as reeds growing by the Nile.

---

30. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 402.
31. E. Vogt, *Untersuchungen zum Buch Ezechiel. AnBibl* 95 (1981), 145.
32. For a further discussion of units of length and weight, see also *AncIsr,* I, 195ff.
33. → מנורה *m^enôrâ.*
34. M. Noth, *Exodus. ATD* V ([6]1978), *in loc.;* see also M. Görg, *BN* 15 (1981) 21-29.
35. For a discussion of these see Görg.
36. → VIII, 403.
37. Görg; → VIII, 403-4.

What is uncertain is the form of the branches. Were they straight or curved? The use of the term *qāneh* leads Busink to the assumption of a stand with straight branches (the shaft, also called *qāneh,* being straight as well), similar to the one over the Torah niche in the Dura Europos synagogue.[38] This assumption is supported, he argues, by the Talmud, "which says that the Hasmoneans at the beginning of their rule were not rich enough to replace the lampstand plundered by Antiochus IV Epiphanes and therefore made one of iron covered with wood. The wood covering probably indicates that the stand was envisioned as having straight branches."[39]

The lampstand of the tabernacle, described in Ex. 25 and 37, is modeled on the stand in the second temple. Concerning the stand in the Solomonic temple (1 K. 7:49; cf. 2 Ch. 4:7) we have no further information; it is unclear whether it even had seven branches. In the case of the third temple, there is evidence for a lampstand with curved arms. According to Busink, it is not clear why the form changed. "The lampstand with straight, oblique branches undoubtedly more closely resembles a tree than does the lampstand with curved branches," and "that the seven-branch lampstand of Ex. 25:31ff. is to be interpreted as a sacred tree can hardly be doubted."[40] Perhaps this similarity was objected to, or Hellenistic influence produced the new form.[41]

4. *Upper Arm.* In Job 31:22 *qāneh* occurs as a hapax legomenon in a context that has something to do with an arm.[42] Its common interpretation as "humerus,"[43] which appeals to the meaning "tube, pipe," has been challenged by Ceresko, who associates it with Ugar. *qēn,* "nest," arriving at the meaning "nest for the arm = shoulder joint."[44] This interpretation is at odds with the translation of Ugar. *qn ḏrʿ* as "arm pipe = upper arm" by Dietrich and Loretz.[45] In conjunction with *ʾezᵉrôaʿ,* "let my arm be broken from *(min)* . . . ," either interpretation is plausible. This is true even though *zᵉrôaʿ* can refer to the entire arm,[46] for an arm can be broken from the humerus as well as from the shoulder joint.

5. *Toponym.* The PN *qānâ* is a by-form of *qāneh;* it appears in Josh. 16:8 and 17:9 as *naḥal qānâ,* the wadi separating Ephraim from Manasseh, and in Josh. 19:28 as *qānâ,* a town in the tribe of Asher probably located some 7 miles southeast of Tyre. This latter identification is not completely certain, since several sites have the same name.[47]

---

38. II, 1161; I, 295, ill. 71.
39. Busink, II, 1161; Bab. *Roš Haš.* 246; *Menaḥ.* 28b.
40. Busink, II, 1064, 1062; on the symbolism of the lampstand see also A. M. Goldberg, *ZDMG* 117 (1967) 232-46.
41. Goldberg, *ZDMG* 117 (1967) 232-46.
42. J. Gray, *SVT* 15 (1966), 268.
43. *HAL,* III, 1113.
44. A. R. Ceresko, *Job 29–31 in the Light of Northwest Semitic. BietOr* 36 (1980), 147.
45. M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *UF* 18 (1986) 109.
46. → IV, 132.
47. *HAL,* s.v.; A. Alt, *KlSchr,* III (1959), 66.

III. LXX. The LXX uses a variety of translations for *qāneh,* depending on the specific meaning in each OT context. As a plant we find *kálamos* 18 times, *pythmēn* twice, and *kinnámōn* once. In figurative usage *kaláminos* is used 3 times and *thymíama* once. For measurements we find *pēchys* and *zygós/n* (once each), as well as *kálamos.* The branches and shaft of the *m*ᵉ*nôrâ* are represented by *kalamískos* (12 times). In Job 31:22 the LXX uses *ankṓn,* "elbow," probably understanding *qāneh* as part of the arm rather than the shoulder joint.

IV. Dead Sea Scrolls. The Dead Sea Scrolls contain 4 occurrences of *qāneh.* In 11QT 9:9-10 the fragmentary state of the text precludes interpretation. 1Q16 9-10, 3 cites and interprets the phrase *ḥyyt qnh* in Ps. 68:31(30). In 1QH 7:2 and 8:33, as in Job 31:22, the meaning is unclear.

Lamberty-Zielinski

קָסַם *qāsam;* קֶסֶם *qesem;* מִקְסָם *miqsām*

I. 1. Etymology; 2. LXX. II. Semantics and Distribution. III. Lexical Field. IV. Ancient Near East: 1. Egypt; 2. Babylonia and Assyria; 3. Pre-Islamic Arabia. V. OT: 1. Positive or Neutral Assessment; 2. Negative Assessment; 3. The King.

I. 1. *Etymology.* The root *qsm* occurs in Northwest and South Semitic (Syr. *qṣm* and Mand. *kṣm* through assimilation) with a wide range of meanings. In Hebrew it means "practice divination," in Middle Hebrew "decide, practice divination, practice magic,"[1] as well as "cut, carve,"[2] in Jewish Aramaic "practice magic."[3] Samaritan[4] and Christian

---

qāsam. A. Barucq, "Oracle et divination," *DBS,* VI, 752-88; A. Caquot and M. Leibovici, eds., *La divination,* I (1968); E. W. Davies, "The Meaning of *qesem* in Prv 16,10," *Bibl* 61 (1980) 554-56; E. Dhorme, "Les religions de Babylonie et d'Assyrie," *Mana,* 1/II (²1949), 1-330; R. Dussaud, "Les religions des hittites et des hourrites, des phéniciens et des syriens," *Mana,* 1/II (²1949), 331-494; O. Eissfeldt, "Wahrsagung im AT," *KlSchr,* IV (1968), 271-75; T. Fahd, "Une pratique cléromantique à la Kaʿba préislamique," *Sem* 8 (1958) 55-79; A. R. Johnson, *The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel* (Cardiff, ²1962), esp. 31-36; J. Lindblom, "Lot-Casting in the OT," *VT* 12 (1962) 164-78; J. Lust, "The Mantic Function of the Prophet," *Bijdragen* 34 (1973) 234-50; *idem,* "On Wizards and Prophets," *SVT* 26 (1974), 133-42; J. Pedersen, *Der Eid bei den Semiten* (Strasbourg, 1914); H. Ringgren, *Israelitische Religion. RM* 26 (1963), esp. 187-88; F. Schmidtke, "Träume, Orakel und Totengeister als Künder der Zukunft in Israel und Babylonien," *BZ* 11 (1967) 240-46; W. R. Smith, "On the Forms of Divination and Magic Enumerated in Deut. XVIII, 10.11. Part I," *Journal of Philology* 13 (1885) 273-87; J. Wellhausen, *Reste arabischen Heidentums* (Berlin, ²1897). → כשׁף *kšp.*

1. *WTM,* IV, 346.
2. Jastrow, 1396.
3. *WTM,* IV, 346.
4. *LOT,* II, 588, 661.

Palestinian[5] *qsam* and *qṣam* mean "practice divination"; the Palmyrene noun *qsm* means "divination";[6] Syr. *qṣam,* "soothsay, practice divination"[7]; Mand. *kṣm,* "practice divination, enchant";[8] OSA *mqsm,* "lot";[9] Eth. *qasama* II, "inquire of an oracle,"[10] Tigr. "summon (to court)," as a noun "lot, oath";[11] Arab. *qasama,* "divide, part, distribute, partition; apportion (of God or fate)," IV: "take an oath, swear," X *(istiqsām):* "seek an oracle from the deity, cast lots,"[12] the last in the context of an arrow oracle.[13] The strikingly wide range of meanings (esp. in Arabic) from "divide" through "seek (or give) an oracle" is usually explained as being associated with the deity's apportionment by lot or by arrow oracle.[14] Another interpretation derives the meaning "oath" from "decision."[15]

Probably Akk. *kasāmu,* "cut apart,"[16] represents a variant of *qsm/qṣm,*[17] especially since there appears to be a semantic similarity (cf. Arab. "divide"). It is therefore possible that the meaning "decision" for Heb. *qesem* in Prov. 16:10 is etymologically justified.[18]

2. *LXX.* As a rule the LXX uses forms for *manteúesthai* to translate *qāsam,* using *mántis* for the ptcp. *qōsēm,* and *manteía* or *manteíon* for *qesem* (and once for *miqsām*).

II. Semantics and Distribution. The verb *qsm,* which appears only in the qal, generally means "engage in divination, soothsay," without specifying the means. Exceptions are 1 S. 28:8, "soothsay through the shade *(bā'ôḇ),*"[19] and Ezk. 21:26(Eng. 21), from the context "consult the arrow oracle."

Of the 19 occurrences of verb forms — Ezk. 21:28(23) should be emended to *qesem*[20] — 12 are of the ptcp. *qōsēm.* Three of these are verbal, 9 substantival ("soothsayer"). In addition, Isa. 2:6 should be emended to read *qōsᵉmîm.*[21]

In the singular the derived noun *qesem* (12 times) without a preceding verb means "divination"; exceptions are Nu. 23:23 and 1 S. 15:23, "magic," and Prov. 16:10, "deci-

---

5. F. Schulthess, *Lexicon Syropalaestinum* (Berlin, 1903), 182-83.
6. *DISO,* 261; but see J. T. Milik, *Dédicaces faites par des dieux. Recherches d'épigraphie proche-orientale,* I (1972), 279ff., who interprets it as the verb "distribute."
7. *LexSyr,* 687.
8. *MdD,* 222.
9. Beeston, 108.
10. *LexLingAeth,* 432.
11. *WbTigr,* 245-46.
12. Wehr, 763.
13. Wellhausen, 132-33.
14. *Ibid.; HAL,* III, 1115.
15. Pedersen, 12.
16. *AHw,* I, 453; *CAD,* K, 140-41.
17. Personal communication from B. Kienast; cf. also *AHw,* I, 453.
18. See also Pedersen, 12.
19. → I, 133-34; for a different interpretation see *HAL,* III, 1115.
20. See *BHS.*
21. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1991), 99; others read *miqsām.*

sion." The plural in Nu. 22:7 means either "fees for divination" or, better,[22] "instruments of divination" (possibly a gloss[23]). The *figura etymologica qsm qsm(ym)* means approximately "practice divination (by lot)" (Dt. 18:10; 2 K. 17:17; Ezk. 13:23; 21:26[21]).

The noun *miqsām,* "oracle,"[24] appears twice, in construct phrases with a pejorative meaning: *miqsam ḥālāq,* "oracle of the smooth" = "flattering oracle" (Ezk. 12:24);[25] and *miqsam kāzāḇ,* "lying oracle" (Ezk. 13:7), in both passages parallel with "false visions" *(ḥᵃzôn šāw', maḥᵃzēh šāw').*

Occurrences of the root are very unevenly distributed. There are 2 in Numbers, 3 in Deuteronomy, 6 in the rest of the Dtr History (1 in Joshua, 3 in 1 Samuel, 2 in 2 Kings), 2 in Proto-Isaiah, one each in Deutero-Isaiah and Zechariah; but there are 3 each in Jeremiah and Micah(!), and no fewer than 12 in Ezekiel. There is only one occurrence in wisdom literature (Prov. 16:10). In other words, in the case of *qsm* we are dealing with a theme of Dtn/Dtr literature and the literary prophets.

III. Lexical Field. The lexical field associated most closely with *qsm* includes *ḥzh,* "see" (positively: Mic. 3:11; negatively, with *šāw',* "falsehood," as obj.: Ezk. 13:6,9,23; 21:34[29]; 22:28; cf. also Ezk. 21:28[23] and Zec. 10:2, with *šeqer;* occasionally in connection with the ostensible proclamation of a word of God: Ezk. 13:10; 22:28), as well as the telling of false dreams *(ḥᵃlōmôṯ haššāw')* and the giving of empty consolation *(nḥm* [piel] *heḇel)* (Zec. 10:2).

In Dt. 18:10 *qsm* appears in a series of participial forms: *'br* (hiphil) *bā'ēš,* "make [a son or daughter] pass through the fire"; *'nn* (polel), "practice divination" (etymology uncertain); *nḥš* (piel), "soothsay, seek omens"; *kšp* (piel), "practice magic"; *ḥbr ḥeḇer,* "practice sorcery"; *š'l 'ôḇ,* "consult a shade"; *š'l yiddᵉ'ōnî,* "consult one with access to a knowing one [i.e., a shade]";[26] *drš 'el hammēṯîm,* "consult the dead." We also find *qsm* in parallel with *'br* (hiphil) *bā'ēš* and *nḥš* in 2 K. 17:17, as well as with *mkr* (hithpael) *laᵃśôṯ hāra' bᵉ'ênê yhwh,* "sell oneself to do evil in the sight of the Yahweh [to offend him]." This last is to be understood as a kind of summary of the catalog of vices that begins in v. 16 with a list of cultic offenses.

The noun *qesem* parallels the piel of *nḥš* in Nu. 23:23; the construct phrase *qesem 'ᵉlîl,* "worthless divination," parallels *ḥᵃzôn šeqer,* "lying vision," in Jer. 14:14. Ezk. 21:26(21) lists synonyms indicating the techniques of *qsm: qll* (pilpel) *baḥiṣṣîm,* "shake the arrows"; *š'l battᵉrāpîm,* "consult the teraphim"; *r'h bakkāḇēḏ,* "inspect the liver."

The ptcp. *qōsēm,* "soothsayer," appears as a title alongside several nouns: *nᵉnîm* and *'ōnᵉnîm,* "diviners" (Dt. 18:14; Isa. 2:6 cj.); *kōhᵃnîm,* "priests" (of the Philistines) (1 S. 6:2); in an extensive list of occupational groups, *nāḇî',* "prophet," *zāqēn,* "elder,"

22. W. Gross, *Bileam. SANT* 38 (1974), 142.
23. Gross.
24. *HAL,* II, 628.
25. On the substantival use of the adjective see *GK,* §128w.
26. Cf. *HAL,* II, 393.

ḥ^a^ḵam ḥ^a^rāšîm, "skillful magician," *n^e^ḇôn laḥaš,* "expert enchanter" (Isa. 3:2-3). In more relevant contexts, it appears in Jer. 27:9 in conjunction with *n^e^ḇî'îm,* "prophets," *ḥōl^e^mîm* (cj.),[27] "dreamers," *'ôn^e^nîm,* "diviners," and *kaššāpîm,* "magicians"; and in Jer. 29:8 in parallel with *n^e^ḇî'îm,* "prophets," qualified by "dreams." Mic. 3:7 uses it in parallel with *ḥōzîm,* "seers"; Isa. 44:25 in parallel with *bārîm,* "interpreters" (cj.),[28] and *ḥ^a^ḵāmîm,* "the wise." Finally, it appears in Zec. 10:2 in parallel with *t^e^rāpîm,* "teraphim."

IV. Ancient Near East.

1. *Egypt.* In Egypt the use of oracles, which was rooted in popular religion, was not incorporated into the official religion until relatively late; the earliest evidence dates from the New Kingdom. Oracles served to illuminate the past as well as to help reach decisions in the face of political problems such as rebellion (Thutmose IV). Oracles could also impart promises to the king.[29] The bull gods Apis and Mnevis served as oracular agents, "messengers" *(wḥmw)* of Ptah or Re. "Messenger servants of the deity" *(ḥm-nṯr wḥm),* priests of the highest rank, were authorized to expound the god's oracular pronouncements.[30] The god (or the god's image) could reply to a question with a favorable sign (a nod?); a verbal answer was also possible.[31] In Egypt dreams above all were thought to provide divine guidance; but since dreams only intimated the future, they required interpretation. If a dream book could not provide the interpretation, the dreamer had to seek the help of a professional dream interpreter, most likely to be found among the officials associated with the "house of life," which was responsible for keeping all religious and magical documents.[32] A king's dream was considered a revelation of the god appearing in the dream; such a dream oracle could also be evoked by incubation.[33] Israel was familiar with Egyptian divination (Gen. 41:8; Isa. 19:3).

2. *Babylonia and Assyria.* Divination played an even greater role in Babylonia and Assyria, after the example of Sumer. "It was for the sake of the expected omen that sacrifice was offered, symbolic acts were performed, and incantations were recited."[34] The *bārû* priests were responsible for divination *(bārûtu).* Besides the primary forms of divination, hepatoscopy and examination of the heavens, we may mention (among many others) observation of storms and other meteorological phenomena as well as the movements of animals, divination by oil, and birth omens.[35] The office of *bārû* was un-

---

27. See *BHS.*
28. *HAL,* I, 153; K. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja. BK* XI/1 (1970), 453-54.
29. *RÄR,* 561ff.
30. S. Morenz, *Ägyptisch Religion. RM* 8 (1960), 109.
31. *RÄR,* 562-63.
32. *Ibid.,* 836.
33. *Ibid.*
34. M. Jastrow, *Die Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens,* II (Giessen, 1912), 141.
35. See the comprehensive presentation *ibid.,* 203-969.

der the protection of the gods, especially Shamash; after hepatoscopy, for example, the inquiry would be addressed a second time to Shamash.[36] Ezk. 21:26-27(21-22) describes Nebuchadnezzar II as employing an arrow oracle, but such an oracle is not attested in Babylonian sources.[37]

3. *Pre-Islamic Arabia.* In pre-Islamic Arabia we find an oracle called *mas'al,* "place/means of inquiry"; this oracle was uttered through the mouth of a priest. There was also an oracle obtained by casting lots, Arab. *maqsam,* mentioned in connection with a feast of the god *Ḥālifān.*[38] Fahd describes an oracle at the Kaaba involving seven inscribed arrows; the lot was cast not by a priest but by the "guardian of the sanctuary."[39] Here we have a precise parallel to the arrow oracle cast by Nebuchadnezzar for Jerusalem as described in Ezk. 21:26-27(21-22). Something similar appears to lie behind Hos. 4:12 (consulting a piece of wood and sticks).

V. OT.

1. *Positive or Neutral Assessment.* The primarily negative assessment of divination in the OT stands in some contrast to the historical evidence: the Urim and Thummim entrusted to the Levites (Dt. 33:8) and the ephod (1 S. 30:7-8) were considered legitimate means of consulting Yahweh, although they are not associated with the root *qsm.* In the 8th century, however, the *qōsēm* was important enough to be listed by Isaiah between the prophet *(nāḇî')* and the elder *(zāqēn),* albeit also with the "skillful magician" *(ḥᵃḵam ḥᵃrāšîm)* and the "expert enchanter" *(nᵉḇôn laḥaš),* among the "support" that Yahweh will take away from Jerusalem (Isa. 3:2; cf. vv. 1-3).

Although Isaiah himself held divines in low esteem — even though his attack on the plethora of "diviners from the east" and "soothsayers *('ōnᵉnîm)* like the Philistines" (Isa. 2:6 cj.) is probably not authentic — for Micah (3:6) both *ḥāzôn* and *qsm* are absolutely legitimate vehicles of prophetic knowledge. What Micah finds reprehensible is not that the *qōsᵉmîm,* named in parallel with the *nᵉḇî'îm* (!),[40] responded (by what means?) to inquiries directed to them by individuals, but that they did so for money (Mic. 3:11; cf. v. 5), "valuing self-interest above truth."[41] To punish them, Yahweh will take away their sources of knowledge (vv. 6-7). Lust maintains that since the time of Jehoshaphat the prophets (in Judah) had officially taken over the function of divination, replacing the repudiated necromancers and soothsayers.[42] But if so, what function would the *qōsᵉmîm* (Mic. 3:6,11) have had?

36. Dhorme, 281-82.
37. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1979), 443; Fahd, 57.
38. *CIH,* 548; M. Höfner, in H. Gese, M. Höfner, and K. Rudolph, *Die Religionen Altsyriens, Altarabiens und der Mandäer. RM* 10/2 (1970), 334-35.
39. P. 60.
40. H. F. Fuhs, *Sehen und Schauen. FzB* 32 (1978), 209.
41. W. Rudolph, *Micha. KAT* XIII/3 (1975), 72.
42. "Mantic Function," 250.

2. *Negative Assessment.* As a rule the OT repudiates *qsm* because it is a practice of the pagan nations — the Canaanites (Dt. 18:9-10,14[43]), the Philistines (1 S. 6:2; cf. Isa. 2:6 cj.), the Babylonians (Isa. 44:25), the Ammonites (Ezk. 21:34[29]), the surrounding nations in general (Jer. 27:9 [post-Jeremianic]). As Balaam the son of Peor, from Pether, the *qōsēm* par excellence (albeit employed by Yahweh for his own purposes; Josh. 13:22; cf. Nu. 22–24; 22:7), must boast: "Surely there is no enchantment *(naḥaš)* in Jacob, no divination *(qesem)* in Israel" (Nu. 23:23a).[44] It was clearly the similarity of *qsm* to enchantment and magic that aroused hostility in Israel, in contrast to the traditional means of consulting Yahweh.[45] This holds true above all for necromancy, the mantic practice most repugnant to the OT: when Saul was in desperate straits, he asked the medium at Endor to conjure up the shade of Samuel (1 S. 28:8), even though he should have been expelling the mediums from Israel or slaying them (28:3,9). For Samuel (15:23), the rebelliousness *(m^erî)* of Saul, who was hostile to magic, is as reprehensible as the sin of *qesem* (par. *t^erāp̱îm*). In an exhaustive list of magical practices associated with the peoples of Canaan (Dt. 18:9-12),[46] the Dtn law explicitly prohibits divination (Dt. 18:10); cf. the citation of this law in 11QT 60:18, the only occurrence of *qsm* in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Just as Yahweh promised to drive out the nations before Israel on account of these abominations (Dt. 18:12), so he will remove Israel itself from his sight, in large measure on account of these same abominations, as DtrH summarizes Israel's fate (2 K. 17:17-18). Jeremiah already attacked the prophets who proclaimed visions of their own minds (Jer. 23:16,18); a later redaction of the book of Jeremiah lumps such prophets together with the "diviners" (*qōs^emîm,* 29:8) and charges them with "worthless divination" (*qesem we^*e*lîl* par. *tarmîṯ libbām,* 14:14). Ezekiel above all castigates the "false visions" and "lying divination" of the prophets (preaching God's favor) (Ezk. 13:6,7,9; 22:28); Yahweh will put an end to them (13:23; cf. Mic. 3:6): in the future such visions and divination will no longer exist in Israel (Ezk. 12:24 [secondary?]). But Zec. 10:1-2 still assumes that in a time of drought Israel would resort to magic and turn to *t^erāp̱îm* and *qôs^emîm.*

3. *The King.* Two texts speak of a *qesem* of the king. In Ezk. 21:26-27(21-22) Nebuchadnezzar uses an arrow oracle to decide whether to attack Ammon or Jerusalem first (cf. v. 25[20]); the oracle decides in favor of Jerusalem. Nor is this pagan oracle by any means without import, as the people (in Jerusalem) suppose (v. 28[23]). In other words, Yahweh can make use of a pagan oracle against his own people.

Prov. 16:10 speaks of the king in general terms: "*qesem* is on the lips of the king." Citing Ezk. 21:26-27(21-22) and Prov. 18:18, Davies theorizes that, when faced with a difficult legal decision, the king might consult an oracle, casting lots or using arrows. But this *māšāl* hardly suggests such a situation. Here *qesem* clearly takes on the

---

43. On the problems raised by this passage, see U. Rüterswörden, *Von der politischen Gemeinschaft zur Gemeinde. BBB* 65 (1987), 76-88.

44. Translation following M. Noth, *Numeri. ATD* VII (⁴1982), *in loc.;* but cf. NRSV.

45. → דרשׁ *dāraš.*

46. On the dating of this section see Rüterswörden, *Gemeinschaft.*

broader meaning "decision," quite apart from the question whether there is an etymological basis for this interpretation.[47] Israel, like the rest of the ancient Near East, believed that the king shared in the wisdom of the deity (Prov. 8:15; 2 S. 14:17,20); his decision, therefore, is tantamount to a divine decision.

Ruppert

47. See I.1 above.

קֵץ *qēṣ*

I. Etymology: 1. Root; 2. Occurrences; 3. Ugaritic and Syriac; 4. Translations; 5. Idioms; 6. Plays on Words; 7. Textual Problems. II. Connotation: 1. Conceptual Usage; 2. Spatial Usage; 3. Temporal Usage. III. Temporal Usage: 1. End (of Lifetime); 2. Period of Time; 3. Historical Period; 4. Eschatology. IV. Later Usage: 1. Period of Time; 2. Plural; 3. Nuances of Meanings; 4. Lifetime; 5. Historical Period; 6. Eschatology; 7. Historical Schema.

qēṣ. G. W. Ahlström, *Joel and the Temple Cult of Jerusalem. SVT* 21 (1971), esp. 2-3; J. Barr, *Biblical Words for Time. SBT* 1/33 (^{2}1969); J. A. Bewer, "On the Text of Ezekiel 7:5-14," *JBL* 45 (1926) 223-31; G. Delling, "τέλος," *TDNT,* VIII, 49-57; K. Elliger, *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer. BHT* 15 (1953); T. H. Gaster, "Ezekiel and the Mysteries," *JBL* 60 (1941) 289-310; J. Geyer, "קצות הארץ — Hellenistic?" *VT* 20 (1970) 87-90; G. Kittel, "ἔσχατος," *TDNT,* II, 697-98; H. Kosmala, "'At the End of the Days,'" *ASTI* 2 (1963) 27-37; J. Licht, "Time and Eschatology in Apocalyptic Literature and in Qumran," *JJS* 16 (1965) 177-82; *idem,* "תורת העתים של כת מדבר יהודה ושל מהשבי קיצין אחרים," *ErIsr* 8 (1967) 63-70; *idem,* "קץ," *EMiqr,* VII, 211-12; H.-G. Link, "ἔσχατος," *Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum NT,* II/2 (4 vols.; ^{3}1972), 1488-91; A. Mertens, *Das Buch Daniel im Lichte der Texte vom Toten Meer. SBS* 12 (1971), esp. 146-48; F. Nötscher, *Zur theologischen Terminologie der Qumran-Texts. BBB* 10 (1956), esp. 167-69; F. S. North, "Four-Month Seasons of the Hebrew Bible," *VT* 11 (1961) 446-48; G. von Rad, *Die Priesterschrift im Hexateuch. BWANT* 65 (1934); A. Strobel, *Untersuchungen zum eschatologischen Verzögerungsproblem auf Grund der spätjüdisch-urchristlichen Geschichte von Hab 2,2ff. NovTSup* 2 (1961); S. Talmon, *Between the Bible and the Mishnah* (1989); *idem,* "Die Entstehung des Gebets als Institution in Israel im Licht der Literatur von Qumran," *Gesellschaft und Literatur in der Hebräischen Bibel. Information Judentum* 8 (1988), 190-208; *idem,* "The Gezer Calendar and the Seasonal Cycle of Ancient Canaan," *JAOS* 83 (1963) 177-87 = *King, Cult, and Calendar* (1986), 89-112; *idem,* "The 'Manual of Benedictions' of the Sect of the Judaean Desert," *RevQ* 2 (1959/60) 475-500; *idem, The World of Qumran from Within* (1989); W. C. van Unnik, "Der Ausdruck ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς (Apostelgeschichte 1:8) und sein alttestamentlicher Hintergrund," *Studia biblica et semitica. FS T. C. Vriezen* (Wageningen, 1966), 335-49; J. VanderKam, *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time* (New York, 1998); M. Wagner, "קֵץ *qēṣ* Ende," *THAT,* II, 659-63; M. Wallenstein, "Some Lexical Material in the Judaean Scrolls," *VT* 4 (1954) 211-14; N. Wieder, "The Term קץ in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in Hebrew Liturgical Poetry," *JJS* 5 (1954) 22-31.

I. Etymology.

1. *Root.* The noun *qēṣ* derives from the Common Semitic root → קצץ *qṣṣ,* "cut off, cut to pieces." From the by-form *qṣh* derive the nouns *qāṣeh* (95 times), *qēṣeh* (5 times), and *qāṣâ* (37 times), meaning "end" (spatial or temporal), "edge(s)" (of the earth [4 times] or the heavens [Jer. 49:36]).

2. *Occurrences.* The noun *qēṣ* occurs 67 times in Biblical Hebrew (10 times in the Pentateuch, 6 times in Joshua–Kings, 20 times in the Prophets, and 31 times in the Writings); it is especially common in Dnl. 8–12 (15 times) and Ezekiel (9 times, 5 in ch. 7). In Biblical Hebrew both *qēṣ* and *qēṣeh* appear only in the singular, whereas the partially synonymous words *qāṣeh* and *qāṣâ* appear also in the plural. The pl. *qṣym* is used in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in postbiblical literature.[1]

The unmodified word appears 18 times. There are 8 occurrences with the definite article, 2 of which use the prep. *lᵉ* (Hab. 2:3; Dnl. 12:13); *qēṣ* occurs 31 times in the construct, 4 of which are without a preposition, 5 with the prep. *lᵉ*, and 22 with *min.*[2] Nine times we find *qēṣ* with a pronominal suffix: 2 with the first-person singular (Ps. 39:5[Eng. 4]; Job 6:11), 1 with the second singular (Jer. 51:13), 4 with the third singular (Isa. 37:24; Dnl. 9:26; 11:45; 2 K. 19:23 *K* קִצֹּה, *Q* קִצּוֹ), and 2 with the first plural (Lam. 4:18 [twice]).

3. *Ugaritic and Syriac.* Ugar. *qṣ* (8 times) denotes the corner of a garment,[3] the edge(s) of the earth, and a slice of meat;[4] once it may mean "meal."[5] Syr. *qeṣṣā/qe'ṣā* means "end, fate, death."

4. *Translations.* Aramaic translates *qēṣ* with *qîṣā',* *qiṣṣā',* and *qēṣ;*[6] Syriac uses *qe'ṣā* and (once) *ṣawpā'* (Ezk. 7:1-2).

The LXX uses a variety of words: *péras* (17 times), *syntéleia* (17 times), *kairós* (8 times), *télos* (7 times), and *éschatos* (only once). The Vg. usually translates *qēṣ* by *finis,* most often in combination with *tempus* (Ezk. 7:2,3,4; Hab. 2:3; Dnl. 8:19; 11:13,27; etc.).[7] Reflecting the essential sense of the Hebrew text, the Vg. occasionally uses a vague translation like *post multos dies* (Gen. 4:3; cf. 8:6) or *post dies plurimos* (Jer. 13:6).

5. *Idioms.* In conformity with the spatial, temporal, or abstract meaning of the context, *qēṣ* appears with a variety of verbs: *hāyâ* (Gen. 4:3; 8:6; 41:1; etc.), *bô'* (Gen. 6:13; 2 K. 19:23; Isa. 37:24; Jer. 50:26; 51:13; Ezk. 7:2,6; 21:30,34[25,29]; Am. 8:2;

---

1. See IV.2 below.
2. See II.2 and III.2 below.
3. *KTU,* 1.16, III, 3; Wagner, 659.
4. *KTU,* 1.3, I, 8; 1.4, VI, 57(?).
5. *KTU,* 1.114, 2; S. E. Loewenstamm, *UF* 1 (1969) 73.
6. Jastrow, 1403-4.
7. Barr, 128.

Lam. 4:18; Dnl. 11:45), *qāraḇ* (Lam. 4:18), *hālaḵ* (Dnl. 12:13), *yāṣāʾ* (2 Ch. 21:19), *pwḥ* (Hab. 2:3), *yāraḏ* (2 Ch. 18:2), *ḥāṭam* (Dnl. 12:4,9), *šûb* (Nu. 13:25), *rāʾâ* (Ps. 119:96), *ydʿ* (Ps. 39:5[4]), *šāʾal* (Neh. 13:6), *śîm* (Job 28:3), *ḥbr* (Dnl. 11:6), and *pāqaḏ* (Isa. 23:17; Jer. 50:27; cf. 1QH 1:16; CD 1:1).[8]

6. *Plays on Words.* In prophetic literature the phonetic similarity of *qēṣ* to *qayiṣ,* "summer" (the last season of the year), and *qîṣ/hēqîṣ,* "wake up, awaken," leads to paronomasia pertaining to the "end." The outstanding examples are Ezk. 7:1ff., Am. 8:1-3 (cf. Jer. 24), and Isa. 18:6.[9]

7. *Textual Problems.* The adj. *qîṣôn,* "last, outermost," occurs 4 times (Ex. 26:4,10; 36:11,17); it derives from *qēṣ,* probably after the analogy of *ḥûṣ-ḥîṣôn* or *riʾšôn.*[10]

The reading *mᵉlôn qiṣṣōh* in 2 K. 19:23 probably arose from a mishearing of *mᵉrôm qiṣṣô* (Isa. 37:24). In 2 Ch. 21:19 *šānîm* should be read instead of MT *haqqēṣ lᵉyāmîm šᵉnayim.* The explanation of *qinṣê* in Job 18:2 as a by-form of *qiṣṣê* through geminate dissimilation is to be rejected. The pl. *qiṣṣîm* is not found in Biblical Hebrew;[11] accordingly, the form *qinṣê* would be a hapax legomenon. In a similar context (Job 16:3), we find the sg. *hᵃqēṣ lᵉḏiḇrê-rûaḥ.* In Dnl. 9:25 the emendation of *bᵉṣôq hāʿittîm* to *bᵉqēṣ hāʿittîm* is dubious, as is the interpretation of *hᵉqîṣōṯî* in Ps. 139:18 as a denominative from *qēṣ.*[12]

II. Connotation. The basic meaning of *qēṣ* is "division"; it can be used abstractly (Sam. *qṣym/qṣ* = MT *pršh/pršwt* for the divisions of the Pentateuch), spatially, or temporally, referring to constituent parts of an inclusive whole, the extreme limit of a space, or an end point in time. It is not always possible to decide whether the translation "division" or "end" is preferable. At times the decision must depend on the context or contextual synonyms.

1. *Conceptual Usage.* The use of *qēṣ* in parallel with *taḵlîṯ* in Job 28:3 and its combination with *tiḵlâ* in Ps. 119:96 show that in these texts it has the meaning "purpose, goal." Used in parallel with *rabbâ/harbēh,* "great, much" (Job 22:5: "Is not your wickedness great? There is no end *(ʾên qēṣ)* to your iniquities") or in apposition (Eccl. 12:12: "Of making many books there is no end [*ʾên qēṣ*], and much study is a weariness of the flesh"; Isa. 9:6[7]: "His authority is great, and there is no end [*ʾên qēṣ*] to peace"), the expression *ʾên qēṣ* is hyperbolic, referring figuratively to "endless" mak-

---

8. *HAL,* III, 1119. On the abstract meaning see II below.

9. See W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1* (Eng. trans. Philadelphia, 1979), 203-4; H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1977), 318-20; J. L. Mays, *Amos. OTL* (1969), 140-41; S. Talmon, *King, Cult, and Calendar* (Jerusalem, 1986), 104; *idem,* → XII, 323-24.

10. Wagner, 659.

11. See I.2 above.

12. On the former see *HAL,* III, 1119; on the latter see H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1989), 511; Wagner, 659.

ing of books, "limitless" iniquity, and "unending peace." We also find *'ên qēṣeh* used in the same sense as *'ên qēṣ* (Isa. 2:7 [twice]; Nah. 2:10[9]; 3:3).

2. *Spatial Usage.* The noun *qēṣ* denotes a spatial end point only in the expression *m^erôm qiṣṣô* par. *m^erôm hārîm* (Isa. 37:24 = 2 K. 19:23: *m^elôn qiṣṣōh;* cf. *lmrḥb 'yn qṣ,* "boundless expanse," in 1QH 6:31). In Dnl. 11:45, in the context of the geographical terms *yammîm* and *har, qēṣ* may have a spatial sense, but the context also admits a temporal interpretation. The same is true for *qēṣ śām laḥōšeḵ* in Job 28:3, which probably refers to the transition from night to day (cf. 1QS 10:1ff.[13]). In any case, this expression was interpreted temporally in Gen. Rab. 89:1: "[God] established a term *(z^eman)* for how many years the world should persist in darkness."[14] In Jer. 50:26 *miqqēṣ* (in contrast to *miqqāṣeh* in 51:31) should be interpreted not spatially but temporally, since in all other instances (21 times) *miqqēṣ* has a temporal sense.[15] In this respect *miqqēṣ* differs from *miqṣēh* (33 times), which is used both temporally (e.g., Gen. 8:3; Dt. 14:28; Josh. 3:2; 9:16) and spatially (e.g., Gen. 47:21; Nu. 34:3; Dt. 13:8[7]; 28:64; Josh. 15:1,2,5,21), and from *miqqāṣâ* (6 times), which is used only spatially.

The notion of a spatial end, an extreme limit, is expressed in Biblical Hebrew by *qāṣâ* (6 times)/*qāṣôṯ* (31 times) or *qāṣeh* (82 times), and 3 times by the plural formula *qaṣwê-'ereṣ* (Isa. 26:15; Ps. 48:11[10]; 65:6[5]),[16] which derives from this noun (or possibly from *qṣw*[17]). In a few instances derivatives of these nouns, particularly *miqṣôṯ* and *miqṣēh* (Gen. 47:2; Jgs. 18:2; 1 K. 12:31; 13:33; Ezk. 33:2; probably also Jgs. 7:11; cf. Dnl. 1:5; Neh. 7:69[70]), have the specialized meaning "pinnacle" or "elite." It is especially noteworthy that *qēṣ* never parallels the expression *min-haqqāṣeh 'el-haqqāṣeh,* "from one end to the other" (4 times).

3. *Temporal Usage.* The primary connotation of *qēṣ* is temporal: "period of time."[18] This meaning is established by association with synonymous temporal terms (a usage that is further developed in the Dead Sea Scrolls and medieval Hebrew[19]): (a) *môʿēḏ* (1) in *parallelismus membrorum* (Hab. 2:3; Dnl. 12:6-7; cf. Sir. 32:10) and (2) in construct relationship or apposition (Dnl. 8:19; 11:27). (b) *ʿēṯ* (1) in parallel (Ezk. 7:6-7; 21:30,34[25,29]; 35:5; Jer. 50:26-27; cf. Sir. 43:6) and (2) in construct relationship or apposition (Dnl. 8:17; 11:40; 12:4,9; 2 Ch. 21:19). Dnl. 11:35 conjoins all three terms: *ʿaḏ-ʿēṯ qēṣ kî-ʿôḏ lammôʿēḏ.* (c) *yôm* combined with *qēṣ* and *ʿēṯ* (Jer. 50:26-27; Ezk. 7:7). (d) *šānîm* with *yāmîm* (conflation?) next to *qēṣ* and *ʿēṯ* (2 Ch. 21:19). (e) The concentration of almost half the occurrences of *qēṣ* (31 of 67) in the Writings, more than a

13. See IV.1.c below.
14. Wieder, 31.
15. W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* XII (^{3}1968), 302; contra Wagner, 660. See III.2 below.
16. See Geyer.
17. Wagner, 660.
18. See III below.
19. On the Dead Sea Scrolls see IV below; on Middle Hebrew see Wieder, 5.

third (24) being found in the books of Ezekiel (9) and Daniel (15), the final recension of which is contemporary with the composition of several of the Dead Sea Scrolls, justifies consideration of additional synonyms in the scrolls, especially *dôr, t^e^qûpâ,* and *z^e^man,*[20] and the use of these synonyms in Rabbinic and medieval Hebrew literature.

III. Temporal Usage. The meaning "temporal end" comes to the fore in many usages of *qēṣ*.

1. *End (of Lifetime).* In first-person statements referring to the human life span, this meaning of *qiṣṣî* is assured by parallel expressions such as "the measure of my days" (Ps. 39:5[4]) and "our days are numbered" (Lam. 4:18; cf. Job 6:11). Am. 8:2 expands the concept to refer to the end of the people of Israel, and Ezk. 7:2-6 also includes the destruction of the land. The account of the deluge exhibits an even more comprehensive usage: *qēṣ kol-bāśār* (Gen. 6:13) refers to the destruction of all flesh.

2. *Period of Time.* In its use as a denotation of the passage of a period of time *miqqēṣ* is primarily followed by (a) a specified number of (1) days (ten, Jer. 42:7; forty, Gen. 8:6; Nu. 13:25) or (2) days and nights (forty, Dt. 9:11), (3) months (two, Jgs. 11:39; twice six, Est. 2:12), or (4) years (two, Gen. 41:1; three, 1 K. 2:39; seven, Dt. 15:1; 31:10; Jer. 34:14; ten, Gen. 16:3; twenty, 2 Ch. 8:1; forty, 2 S. 15:7; Ezk. 29:13; seventy, Isa. 23:15,17; four hundred thirty, Ex. 12:41); or (b) an expression of an undefined span of time: *yāmîm* (Gen. 4:3; 1 K. 17:7; Jer. 13:6). It remains an open question whether *miqqēṣ yāmîm layyāmîm* in 2 S. 14:26 means that Absalom cut his hair "from time to time" or "once a year."[21] In late texts the analogous terms *l^e^qēṣ yāmîm/šānîm/ ʿittîm* (5 times) refer to an indefinite period of time (Dnl. 11:6,13; 12:13; Neh. 13:6; 2 Ch. 18:2). It is possible that *l^e^qēṣ yāmîm* in Neh. 13:6 describes a one-year absence of Nehemiah from Jerusalem.

3. *Historical Period.* Often *qēṣ* denotes a specific span of time in the past or future.[22] The expression *ʿēṯ ʿ^a^wōn qēṣ* (Ezk. 21:30,34[25,29]; 35:5) refers to the period of the monarchy, which ended with the destruction of Jerusalem on account of Israel's sins. Similarly, in Dnl. 9:26 the phrase *w^e^qiṣṣô baššeṭep w^e^ʿaḏ qēṣ milḥāmâ* is to be understood as referring to a historical period of devastating wars that mark the culmination of divine judgment.

The connotation "historical period" or "age" is sometimes (as above) made explicit by association with other temporal terms: *qēṣ* par. *ʿēṯ* (Jer. 50:26-27; Ezk. 7:6-7); *ʿēṯ qēṣ* (Dnl. 8:17; 11:35,40; 12:4,9); inverted: *qēṣ hāʿittîm* (Dnl. 11:13; expanded: Ezk. 35:5) or made manifest by added terms: *kî ʿôḏ lammôʿēḏ* (Dnl. 11:35), *ngʿ hayyôm* (Ezk. 7:12), *b^e^ʿēṯ ʾēḏām* (Ezk. 35:5; cf. *yôm ʾēḏ* [Job 21:30] and 9 times with a pronominal

20. See IV.1.c below.
21. North.
22. Ahlström, 2.

suffix [2 S. 22:19 par. Ps. 18:19(18); etc.]); *bā' yômô bᵉʿēṯ ʿᵃwôn qēṣ* (Ezk. 21:30,34). The phrase *wᵉyāpēaḥ laqqēṣ* in Hab. 2:3, explained by *ʿôḏ ḥāzôn lammôʿēḏ*, refers to an event expected to occur in the near future *(kî-ḇô' yāḇô' yᵉ'aḥēr)*, not in an apocalyptic time frame.[23] This historical interpretation is reflected in 1QpHab 7:1ff.[24]

4. *Eschatology.* Only in a few late biblical texts does *qēṣ* occur in an eschatological context.[25] The expressions *laqqēṣ* and *lᵉqēṣ hayyāmîm* in Dnl. 12:13 clearly refer to the "end of time." In this context the phrase *qēṣ happᵉlā'ôṯ* in v. 6 can also be interpreted eschatologically; but the meaning "appointed age" is preferable to an eschatological interpretation.[26] The expression *qēṣ happᵉlā'ôṯ* anticipates a "wonderful age," the beginning of which is determined by the preceding period of "two and a half times" (v. 7). In Ezk. 7:2-6, similarly, *(haq)qēṣ* denotes an age of destined punishment of the people (cf. vv. 7-8, *qārôḇ, miqqārôḇ*); and Am. 8:2 should not be equated with the eschatological "day of Yahweh" of Am. 5:18ff.[27]

IV. Later Usage. The noun *qēṣ* occurs over 100 times in the Dead Sea Scrolls. There, as in medieval Hebrew, it continues to convey the meaning that developed particularly in the late parts of the Hebrew Bible: "span of time, historical period," not "time" generally or "beginning/opening."[28] This meaning is particularly evident in passages that speak of the duration or end of a defined period: "the *qēṣ* will be extended" (1QpHab 7:7), "the *qēṣ* is extended beyond them" (l. 12), "he did not make known to them the termination *(gmr)* of the *qēṣ*" (l. 2),[29] *ûḵᵉʿēṯ ṣē'ṯ haqqēṣ* (2 Ch. 21:19), "until the termination of the *qēṣ* of these years" (CD 4:8-10).[30]

1. *Period of Time.* Here too the meaning "period of time" is evinced by the association of *qēṣ* with temporal synonyms:

a. *ʿēṯ.* "The *qēṣ* of dominion of all the men of his lot" parallels "the time *(ʿēṯ)* of salvation for the people of God" (1QM 1:5); "at the foundation of the *qēṣ*" parallels "at all the beginnings of time *(ʿēṯ)*" (1QH 12:7-8; 1QH fr. 9:8-10; cf. Sir. 43:6: "The moon marks the (changing) seasons; it rules until the *qēṣ* and is an everlasting sign").

b. *môʿēḏ.* "At the appointed time *(môʿēḏ)* of visitation he will destroy them forever" parallels "in his glorious wisdom he has appointed a *qēṣ* for the existence of wickedness" (1QS 4:18-19); "to destroy the flesh for enduring times" parallels "to extinguish strength for a lengthy time *(qiṣṣîm)*" (1QH 8:31); "and he knows the result of their [the two spirits'] works unto all *qiṣṣîm* [of the *môʿᵃḏîm*]" (1QS 4:25); "your *qiṣṣîm,* [your]

23. Wagner, 662; contra Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1,* 204.
24. Elliger, 190-193; see IV.1 below.
25. M. Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20. AB* 22 (1983), 147.
26. *HAL,* III, 1119; Wagner, 660.
27. Wolff, *Joel and Amos,* 255; Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1,* 203-4; Wagner, 661.
28. Elliger, 182-83, 191-94; contra Wallenstein, 213.
29. Wieder, 30.
30. Ibid.

mô'ᵃḏîm" (1QH 13:20); "in God's time *(mô'ēḏ)* his exalted greatness will shine for all ages *(qiṣṣê* [*'ôlāmîm*])" (1QM 1:8).

These terms may also be joined with *yôm:* "at the time *(qēṣ)* of the festival of rest, on the Day of Atonement" (1QpHab 11:6-7; cf. Jer. 50:26; Ezk. 7:5-7,12; 2 Ch. 21:19).[31] The employment of these expressions with the meaning "appointed period of time" occurs also in medieval Hebrew literature.

c. *Other Terms.* The vocabulary resources of the Dead Sea Scrolls and medieval Hebrew for referring to a period of time include the word *dôr:* "for their generations *(dôr)* . . . for all eternal times *(qiṣṣê 'ôlāmîm)*" (1QS 4:15-16; cf. ll. 13-15). The "last generation *(dôr)*" (1QpHab 2:7; CD 1:12) equals the "last *qēṣ*" (1QpHab 7:12; 1QS 4:16-17). The synonymity of *qēṣ* and *dôr* is also proven by the equation of *qēṣ* and "forty years," the proverbial biblical time span of one generation (CD 8:36-39). Yet another word is *tᵉqûpâ:* "sacred seasons and cycles of the year and everlasting times *(qiṣṣê 'aḏ)*" (1QM 10:15-16); also medieval Heb. *zᵉman.*[32]

d. *From Time to Time.* The meaning "span of time" is evidenced by the temporal use of *miqqēṣ laqqēṣ,* "from one time (of prayer) to another my soul rejoices" (1QH 9:7-8); "praying continually from one time [of prayer or day] to another" (1QH12:4; cf. 1QS 10:1ff.). In the Dead Sea Scrolls the notion of a spatial end is also expressed by *qṣh* (1QpHab 9:14; 10:2; 1QM 1:8), especially in the phrase "from one end to the other" (cf. "a broad place without end [*qēṣ*]," 1QH 6:31).

e. *Word Clusters.* As in the OT,[33] we find in the Dead Sea Scrolls combinations of *qēṣ* with other temporal terms, especially (but not exclusively) in historical contexts: *'ēṯ, dôr, šānîm* (CD 2:8ff.); *mô'ēḏ, dôr, šānîm* (1QH 1:16-20); *'ēṯ, mô'ēḏ* (1QS 1:14-15); *'ēṯ (yôḇēl, šāḇû'ôṯ)* (CD 16:1-4).

2. *Plural.* In the Dead Sea Scrolls, in contrast to the OT,[34] *qēṣ* often occurs in the plural, especially with reference to substantial spans of time: "all their ages *(qiṣṣêhem)* for their generation shall be spent in bitter weeping" (1QS 4:13; cf. 1QH 5:27-28; 8:31; 1QH fr. 1:5; 1QS 4:25-26); "what will come in their ages *(qiṣṣêhem)* for all the years of the *'ôlām* [i.e., forever]" (CD 2:10; cf. 16:2-3). The plural can also refer to the universal order of time: *qiṣṣê 'aḏ* (1QM 10:15-16); *qiṣṣê nēṣaḥ* (1QH 1:24-25), *qiṣṣê 'ôlāmîm* (1QS 4:16; 1QM 1:8-9).

3. *Nuances of Meanings.* In the usage of *qēṣ* in the Dead Sea Scrolls, we can observe a subtle distinction of meanings from which one may legitimately draw conclusions about the connotation of the noun in Biblical Hebrew, especially in later textual strata. The term can be applied to periods of time that are also fixed seasons of prayer or festal days: "he shall praise him at the times that God has appointed" (1QS 9:26–10:1; cf. 1QpHab 7:12-13; 1QH 1:16); "to entreat constantly from *qēṣ* to *qēṣ* . . . at the turnings

31. See II.3 and III.3 above.
32. Wallenstein, 212; cf. Wieder, 31.
33. See II.3 above.
34. See I.2 above.

of the day according to his ordinance . . . at all the beginnings of time *(ʿēṯ),* the foundations of the *qēṣ* and the cycle of the festal times *(môʿᵃḏîm)*" (1QH 12:4-8); "at the time of the festival of rest" (1QpHab 11:6-7); "sacred times and seasons of the years and *qiṣṣê ʿaḏ*" (1QM 10:15-16); and especially "not to transgress a single word of all the words of God in their (appointed) times *(qēṣ)* and not to advance their appointed times *(ʿēṯ)* or delay (the observance of) their fixed seasons *(môʿēḏ)*" (1QS 1:13-14).[35]

4. *Lifetime.* Often *qēṣ* connotes "lifetime." The author of the *Hodayoth* uses the term in his supplication: "Do not forsake me during my (life)time" (1QH fr. 4:18; cf. 1:10-11), just as the psalmist refers to his life span as *qiṣṣî:* "Let me know my *qēṣ* and the number of my days" (Ps. 39:5[4]; cf. Job 6:11).

In the meaning "lifetime," *qēṣ* is synonymous with *dôr,* "generation" (1QS 4:13; cf. 1QpHab 2:7; 7:2; CD 1:12 with 1QpHab 4:16; 7:7,12; 1QS 4:16-17; cf. 1QH 1:19; 6:11; 14:6 with 1QS 4:16; 1QM 1:8-9; CD 2:9-10; and cf. 1QH fr. 5:7 with 1QH 1:24-25). In these passages *qēṣ* and *dôr* appear practically interchangeable.

5. *Historical Period.* As in Dnl. 9:16, in the scrolls *qēṣ* can denote a particular historical period (*qēṣ milḥāmâ,* 1QM 11:8; *qēṣ neḥᵉrāṣâ,* 1QS 4:25). On the basis of Ezk. 4:4-5, the period of God's wrath *(qēṣ ḥᵉrôn)* against Israel following the destruction of the temple is set at 390 years (CD 1:5; cf. 5:20; 1QH 5:11-12).[36]

We find *qēṣ* denotes "era" in a comprehensive overview of history (1QS 11:9; 1QH 12:6-7; cf. CD 8:38) and refers as well to specific historical periods, e.g., "the *qēṣ* of the first visitation" (CD 7:21; cf. 1QS 4:18: "a *qēṣ* for the existence of wickedness and a *môʿēḏ* of visitation"; cf. also CD 20:23; 1QH 3:38; 6:29; 1QH fr. 5:11; 58:5; 59:3; 1QM 1:5). A period during which the Qumran community suffered persecution by its enemies is frequently called a "time *(qēṣ)* of wickedness" (CD 6:10,14; 13:20; 15:7,10; 1QpHab 5:7-8) or "the *qēṣ* of their appearance and the account of their tribulations" (CD 4:5). Cf. medieval Hebrew usage of *qēṣ,* especially *qēṣ māšîaḥ.*[37]

6. *Eschatology.* Only rarely does *qēṣ* occur in an eschatological context: the time of judgment (*qēṣ mišpāṭ:* 1QH 6:29-30); the (end of?) time *(qēṣ)* appointed by God and the creation of a new (time) (1QS 4:25).

7. *Historical Schema.* The extensive but rather vague historical conception in the book of Daniel also turns up in other apocalyptic works (1 En. 85–93; 2 Bar. 56–73).[38] Qumran writers developed this conception into an all-embracing historical schema comprising three primary elements: primeval history, history of Israel, metahistory.[39]

35. Talmon, "Manual."
36. Wieder, 30; Talmon, *World,* 280-82.
37. Bab. *Meg.* 3a; Gen. Rab. 49:1; Bab. *Sanh.* 97b; Wieder, 5.
38. See esp. Licht.
39. Talmon, *Between the Bible.*

These eras are divided into a series of periods called *qēṣ* or *'ēṯ*, as in Ezekiel and Daniel.[40]

This periodization is especially transparent in 4Q180/181 (4QAges of Creation), also called the Pesher on the Periods because of its introductory formula *pēšer 'al haqqiṣṣîm,* and in 11QMelch.[41] A chronicle-like written account (*mspr;* cf. Jgs. 7:15) of the most important events in the history of the Qumranites *(qiṣṣêhem)* is mentioned in CD 2:9-10: "It knows [reports] the years of their existence, and the account and details of their ages *(qēṣ),* for all eternal events and all eternal happenings, that will come to pass in their ages *(qēṣ)* for all the years of the times of the universe *(šᵉnê 'ôlām)*" (cf. 1 Ch. 27:24). This work, no longer extant, presumably began with an account of the early history of Israel, most probably recounted the "exodus" of the founders of the Qumran community from Jerusalem after the destruction of the temple, their experience of "expulsion" (4:5-6, "the years of their exile") and "return" (1:1-7), moved on to a description of afflictions to which they were subject in their own days (4:5-6), and ended with a glimpse of the future, which would culminate with a period called the "days to come" (*bᵉ'aḥᵃrîṯ hayyāmîm,* 4:4; 6:10-11; 1QSa 1:1). Like *'ēṯ, qēṣ* denotes individual phases in this segmental teleological historical schema.[42] This comprehensive conception of history parallels in part the biblical account of the postexilic period (Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Ezra-Nehemiah), which also culminates in a vision of the future *yôm yhwh* (Mal. 3:13ff.).

Talmon

40. Nötscher, 167ff.; Elliger, 183, 192ff.

41. On the former see J. T. Milik, *JJS* 23 (1972) 109-26; *idem, Books of Enoch* (Oxford, 1976), 249; on the latter see P. J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša'. CBQMS* 10 (1981).

42. Licht, "תורת," 69; Elliger, 194.

קָצִין *qāṣîn*

I. 1. Etymology and Meaning; 2. Occurrences. II. Lexical Field. III. Usage: 1. Civilian Leader; 2. Military Leader. IV. LXX.

qāṣîn. R. Hentschke, *Die Stellung der vorexilischen Schriftpropheten zum Kultus. BZAW* 75 (1957), esp. 94 n. 3; J. van der Ploeg, "Les chefs du peuple d'Israel et leurs titres," *RB* 57 (1950) 40-61, esp. 52; W. Richter, "Die Überlieferungen um Jephtah, Ri 10,17–12,6," *Bibl* 47 (1966) 485-556, esp. 488, 498-99; H. N. Rösel, "Jephtah und das Problem der Richter," *Bibl* 61 (1980) 251-55; *idem,* "Die 'Richter Israels,'" *BZ* 25 (1981) 180-203, esp. 203; L. Schmidt, *Menschlicher*

I. 1. *Etymology and Meaning.* The Hebrew noun *qāṣîn* means "chief, ruler." It derives from **qṣy* II, and means literally "a person who has something to decide."[1] The *-n* ending may be analogous to the *-n* of *dayyān.*[2] The noun is often compared to Arab. *qāḍîn,* "judge," but it has a broader meaning. It appears as a proper name in Ugaritic: *qṣn, bn qṣn.*[3] There are occurrences of *qāṣîn* in Middle Hebrew with the same broad meaning as in the OT.[4] Cf. also Sir. 48:15: "ruler."

2. *Occurrences.* There are 12 occurrences of *qāṣîn* in the OT: 1 in Joshua, two in Judges, four in Isaiah, two in Micah, two in Proverbs, and 1 in Daniel.

II. Lexical Field. In three texts (Jgs. 11:11; Mic. 3:1,9), *qāṣîn* appears together with → ראשׁ *rōʾš.* Jgs. 11:11 shows that these two words denote different offices. Josh. 10:24 makes clear that *qāṣîn* can refer to a military office; here, as in Jgs. 11:6,11, and Isa. 22:3, it is associated with → מלחמה *milḥāmâ* or the verb *lḥm.* In Mic. 3:1,9 *(qāṣîn* par. *rōʾš),* we are dealing with juridical terminology; in Isa. 1:10 the word has cultic overtones. Prov. 6:7 uses *qāṣîn* with two other terms denoting offices *(šōṭēr* and *mōšēl).* Schmidt discusses the relationship between *qāṣîn* and → *nāg̱îḏ.*[5] In both military (Jgs. 11:6,11) and civilian (Isa. 3:6-7) contexts the *qāṣîn* was appointed by the citizens of the town.

III. Usage.

1. *Civilian Leader.* Isaiah uses *qāṣîn* three times to denote a civilian leader or ruler. His teaching in 1:10-17 begins with a didactic formula introducing harsh criticism of the current sacrificial cult along with exhortations to do good, seek justice, rescue the oppressed, etc. The responsible leaders, addressed as *qᵉṣînê sᵉḏōm* (v. 10), are indicted along with the people because they have neglected their duty. Isa. 3:1-7 depicts a crisis in which Yahweh has taken away from Jerusalem every prop and stay (v. 1), replacing their princes *(śārîm)*[6] with boys. The people try to find a *qāṣîn* (v. 6), but the one chosen by them refuses, because he has no chance to exercise leadership. He does not even have a cloak, and can neither "heal" the people nor furnish them with bread (v. 7). In these texts *qāṣîn* must be understood as a general term for a leader or ruler whose duty is above all to protect the vulnerable members of his community.

Mic. 3 comprises three oracles of judgment. Those indicted are first reminded of their obligations (v. 1), then follows the indictment. As heads *(rāʾšîm)* and *qᵉṣînîm,* they should know justice. But they hate the good (v. 2) and abhor justice (v. 9). The two

---

Erfolg und Jahwes Initiative. WMANT 38 (1970), esp. 141-71; R. de Vaux, *Early History of Israel* (Eng. trans. Philadelphia, 1978), esp. 760-61.

1. *HAL,* III, 1122.
2. *BLe,* §61nα, with n. 2.
3. *UT,* no. 2257; *WUS,* no. 2436.
4. Jastrow, 1405; *WTM,* IV, 260.
5. Schmidt, 154-55.
6. → שׂר.

words denoting offices must be understood as parallel terms.[7] As in Isaiah, the *qāṣîn* is a ruler whose duty it is to protect the weak.

Prov. 6:7-8 speaks of the *qāṣîn* together with other officials. The lazy individual is admonished to learn from the behavior of the ant: "Without having any *qāṣîn* or officer *(šōṭēr)* or ruler *(mōšēl),* it prepares its food in summer and gathers its sustenance in harvest." Here *qāṣîn* refers to the leader of a working team, who is responsible for its orderly functioning. Prov. 25:15 states that a *qāṣîn* can be persuaded with patience — probably meaning simply that it is better to be cautious when speaking to one's chief. It is impossible to tell whether this chief might be a judge or a prince.[8]

2. *Military Leader.* Josh. 10 describes Joshua's victory over five Canaanite kings. Here the *qāṣîn* is a military officer commanding a group of soldiers (v. 24). Joshua has several *qᵉṣînîm* in his army. We do not know their exact rank; they were probably noncommissioned officers, authorized to think and act independently. But the term does not refer to the commander of the militia.[9] We see from Jgs. 11:6 and 11 that there was a difference between *qāṣîn* and *rō'š*. The elders of Gilead ask Jephthah to be their *qāṣîn* so that they can fight with the Ammonites. When he refuses, they promise that after the victory he can have the office of *rō'š* over all the inhabitants of Gilead. The *qāṣîn* functions as a military commander; the *rō'š* is the ruler of all the citizens.[10]

The context of Isa. 22:3 is also military. The defeat of Jerusalem is particularly bitter because all its military commanders have fled. This probably represents Isaiah's interpretation of the events of 701.[11] In Dnl. 11:18 *qāṣîn* refers to a military commander who avenges the insolence of the king of the north. This *qāṣîn* must be the Roman consul Lucius Cornelius Scipio, who defeated Antiochus III at Magnesia in 190. Here too we do not expect to find a precise title. The author is not trying to translate a particular Roman title, but speaks simply of the commander of the Romans.[12]

IV. LXX. The LXX translates *qāṣîn* four times with *archēgós* or *árchōn* and once with *basileús* (Prov. 25:15). Twice it uses a verbal paraphrase.

Nielsen

7. H. W. Wolff, *Micah* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1990), 97-98.
8. O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos. BK* XVII (1983), 302.
9. Schmidt, 154-55.
10. Rösel, "Jephtah," 253-54.
11. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1997), 359-61.
12. L. F. Hartman and A. A. Di Lella, *Daniel. AB* XXIII (1978), 268, 293.

קָצַף qāṣap; קֶצֶף qeṣep

I. Etymology. II. 1. Distribution; 2. Usage; 3. LXX. III. 1. Secular Contexts; 2. Theological Contexts; 3. Foreign Nations.

I. Etymology. The root appears as a Canaanite gloss in the Amarna texts (*qṣp,* "be incensed") as well as in Akkadian (*kaṣāpu, keṣēpu,* "think").[1] Likewise comparable are Syr. *q*ᵉ*ṣap,* "be angry, distressed";[2] Biblical Aram. *q*ᵉ*ṣap* (Dnl. 2:12; cf. Ezr. 7:23; also Ahiqar 101, *kṣp*[3]); Jewish Aram. *q*ᵉ*ṣap,* "be angry,"[4] and *qeṣep,* "anger" (cf. the name of the angel of destruction); Middle Heb. *qṣp* hiphil, "cause to be angry."[5] The meaning of the verb and related nouns encompasses dismay, indignation, and resentment as well as wrath and anger.

II. 1. *Distribution.* The root *qṣp* appears in a variety of literary contexts (Pentateuch, Dtr History, Chronicler's History, Isaiah, Zechariah, Psalms, Lamentations, Esther, Ecclesiastes). The qal occurs 28 times, the hiphil 5 times, and the hithpael once; the noun *qeṣep* occurs 28 times. Most of the occurrences are late; it should be noted that the word is not found in Sirach or the Dead Sea Scrolls.

---

qāṣap. B. Albrektson, *History and the Gods. CBOT* 1 (1967); J. Boehmer, "Zorn," *ZAW* 44 (1926) 320-22; H. A. Brongers, "Der Zornesbecher," *OTS* 15 (1969) 177-92; G. W. Coats, *Rebellion in the Wilderness* (Nashville, 1968); A. Dillmann, *Handbuch der alttestamentlichen Theologie* (1985), esp. 258ff.; G. R. Driver, "On *ḥēmāh* 'Hot Anger, Fury' and also 'Fiery Wine,'" *TZ* 14 (1958) 133-35; *idem,* "Some Hebrew Roots and Their Meanings," *JTS* 23 (1922) 69-73; W. Eichrodt, *ThAT,* I (⁸1968), esp. 168-76; J. Fichtner and O. Grether, "ὀργή B-C," *TDNT,* V, 392-412; M. García Cordero, "Ira di Dio," *Enciclopedia della Bibbia,* IV (1970), 369-73; J. Gray, "The Wrath of God in Canaanite and Hebrew Literature," *JMEOS* 25 (1947/53) 9-19; P. van Imschoot, *ThAT,* I. *Bibliothèque de Théologie,* III/2 (1954), esp. 87-90; E. Jacob, *ThAT* (1955), esp. 91-93; E. Kautzsch, *Biblische ThAT* (1911), *passim;* E. König, *ThAT kritisch und vergleichend dargestellt* (Stuttgart, ³·⁴1922), esp. 184ff.; N. Lohfink, "Der gewalttätige Gott des ATs und die Suche nach einer gewaltfreien Gesellschaft," *JBT* 2 (1987) 106-36; O. Procksch, *ThAT* (Gütersloh, 1950), esp. 642-53; H. Ringgren, "Einige Schilderungen des göttlichen Zorns," *FS A. Weiser* (Göttingen, 1963), 107-13; *idem,* "Vredens kalk," *SEÅ* 17 (1953) 19-30; G. Sauer, "קצף *qṣp* zornig sein," *THAT,* II, 663-66; *idem,* "Die strafende Vergeltung Gottes in den Psalmen" (diss., Basel, 1957); A. Schenker, "Der strafende Gott," *Katechetische Blätter* 110 (1985) 843-50; W. H. Simpson, "Divine Wrath in the Eighth-Century Prophets" (diss., Boston, 1968); R. V. G. Tasker, *Biblical Doctrine of the Wrath of God* (London, 1951); P. Volz, *Das Dämonische in Jahwe. SgV* 110 (1924); C. Westermann, "Boten des Zorns," *Die Botschaft und die Boten. FS H. W. Wolff* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1981), 147-56; W. Zimmerli, *Grundriss der alttestamentlichen Theologie. TW* 3/1 (³1985), *passim.*

1. EA 82:51; 93:5; *AHw,* I, 456.
2. *LexSyr,* 687.
3. *DISO,* "be enraged(?)."
4. *WTM,* IV, 361.
5. *ANH,* 387.

2. *Usage.* Seventeen times in verbal clauses the acting subject is a person (e.g., Pharaoh [Gen. 40:2; 41:10], Moses [Ex. 16:20; Lev. 10:16; Nu. 31:14]). Surprisingly, Yahweh is directly or indirectly identified as the subject less often (16 times). It should be noted, however, that the contexts in which *qṣp* occurs often focus on theological questions; this is true, for instance, of all the hiphils and the substantive. Besides the late phrases *qeṣep̱ yhwh* (Jer. 50:13; 2 Ch. 29:8; 32:26) and *qeṣep̱ lᵉyhwh* (Isa. 34:2), with few exceptions (e.g., Eccl. 5:16[Eng. 17]), Yahweh is at least the implicit subject.

In most cases the object of *qeṣep̱* is human. Sometimes it is the nations (Jer. 10:10; 50:13; Zec. 1:15; Isa. 34:2); most often, however, it is Israel. In the context of P, *qṣp* focuses primarily on Israel as a cultic community (*ʿēḏâ*, e.g., Lev. 10:6). In the Chronicler's History, "Judah and Jerusalem" are generally the affected entities (2 Ch. 24:18; 29:8; 32:25). Only in Eccl. 5:5(6) is the object "the work of your hands."

The object — usually a group of persons (e.g., *ʿēḏâ*) — is always introduced by *ʿal* (17 times; this observation shows that the use of *ʾel* in Josh. 22:18 is a mistake); the same is true of verbal clauses using *hāyâ qeṣep̱* (10 times) and noun clauses (3 times). In the case of the hiphil, Yahweh is always the "object" affected (4 times, always introduced by *ʾēṯ;* once, if the LXX represents the correct reading in Ps. 106:32, we may assume a pronominal suffix).

There is a surprising variety of parallel terms. In texts using the verb, we find *śᵉrēp̱â, kʿs* hiphil, *ʾnp/ʾap, ḥēmâ, rîḇ, ḥll, gʿr, ʾal zāḵar, qnʾ/qinʾâ, ḥbl* piel, *mʾs, bʿr,* and *mrh.* As an antonym, we may mention *yṭb.* The subst. *qeṣep̱* often appears as the third element of a series (Dt. 29:27[28]; Jer. 21:5; 32:37; Eccl. 5:16[17]). In parallelism *qeṣep̱* stands second in Ps. 102:11(10) and Est. 1:18; it stands first only in Isa. 34:2. Words used in parallel with *qeṣep,* in either the immediate or the extended context,[6] include *ḥēmâ* (5 times), *ʾap* (4 times), *šep̱eṭ, qᵉlālâ, zaʿam, kaʿas, ḥᵒlî, neg̱ep̱,* and *bizzāyôn.* More commonly, however, *qeṣep̱* appears alone (16 times, including the 2 instances of *figura etymologica* in Zec. 1:2,15). As antonyms we find *rāṣôn, ḥeseḏ, raḥᵃmîm,* and *rḥm* piel. Verbal clauses with *qeṣep* as subject (13 times) use the following verbs: *yṣʾ, bôʾ,* and *hyh.* This usage shows that *qeṣep* is understood as an active subject. Indeed, in theological contexts we may define *qeṣep̱* as the concrete instantiation of Yahweh's indignation, emotionally more or less explosive and often destructive (cf. *qeṣep lᵉyhwh* in Isa. 34:2).

Prepositional usage is consonant with these observations: *bᵉ* indicates an instrumental function (6 times); concrete reality is also suggested by *min* and *mippᵉnê.* The origin and reality of *qeṣep̱* are not explained but simply recorded. Usually, however, the causes and consequences can be described.

3. *LXX.* For the verb, the LXX uses *orgízein* (11 times), *parorgízein* (twice), *paroxýnein* (6 times), *lypeín* (6 times), *thymoún* (3 times), and *epikraínein* (twice). The verb is also represented by the nouns *orgḗ* (Nu. 16:22; Josh. 22:18) and *thymós* (Lev. 10:6). The substantive is represented by *orgḗ* (13 times), *thymós* (5 times), *paroxysmós* (twice), *chólos* (once), *metámelos* (once), and *parorgismós* (once). Nu. 1:53 may be an interpretive paraphrase accounting for the *qeṣep̱.*

---

6. → I, 351-53.

III. 1. *Secular Contexts.* When the word is used in secular contexts, the meaning can range from indignation to anger.

At times *qṣp* can have serious consequences. The commanders of the Philistines were angry *(qṣp)* with Achish because he had taken David with him into battle (1 S. 29:4) and effected David's return. Naaman was similarly angered when Elisha sent a servant to inform him that he would have to wash in the Jordan seven times. King Joash aroused the anger of the man of God (evidence of a later stratum[7]) when, performing a symbolic act as instructed by the prophet, he struck the ground only three times, preventing a total victory over the Arameans (2 K. 13:19). Without going into detail, Est. 2:21 reports that two guardians of the threshold became angry at the king and conspired to assassinate him.

According to Eccl. 5:12-16(13-17), the impermanence of riches evokes a response described graphically as *ka'as, ḥºlî,* and *qeṣep̄* (v. 16[17]). Here *qeṣep̄* must mean something like resentment rather than anger. When Vashti refuses to appear at a banquet at the command of her drunken consort, the king's advisors fear that her example will induce disobedience on the part of the noble ladies, provoking their husbands to contempt *(bizzāyôn)* and anger *(qeṣep̄)* (Est. 1:18).

In some texts *qṣp* has negative but not life-threatening consequences. When the cupbearer and baker offended (*ḥāṭeʾû,* Gen. 40:1b) the king of Egypt, he became angry (*qṣp,* v. 2) and had them sent to prison. Gen. 41:10 recalls this scene. Jeremiah's departure to take possession of a field in Benjamin was interpreted as an attempt to desert to the Babylonians. The sentinel took him to the officials, who were enraged (*qṣp,* Jer. 37:15) at the already unpopular prophet, beat him, and imprisoned him.

2. *Theological Contexts.* a. *Verb.* When the verb appears in theological contexts, it is likewise impossible to speak of a single meaning with identical connotations.

The reason why the book of the prophet Zechariah begins with the central words *qṣp* . . . *qeṣep̄* (Zec. 1:2) is that prophets had already called the ancestors of those addressed to return *(šûḇ)* to Yahweh. They refused, and therefore the threatened consequences have come to pass. Even though the language is quite general, the prophet's seriousness is apparent and the new call to repent and return is clear. We may note that *qṣp* does not inherently suggest a trajectory leading to punishment; it represents a way of expressing religious sensibility.

A warning against necromancy (Isa. 8:19) is followed by a description of those guilty of such conduct. Meeting failure on every side, they are distressed and hungry. Their distress turns into a nihilistic rage (*qṣp* hithpael, v. 21) in which they curse every responsible authority: the king and even God.

Later wisdom literature understands that destruction (*ḥbl* piel) of the work of human hands can be a consequence of God's anger (Eccl. 5:5[6]).

Sometimes *qṣp* is used in developing a theology of history. Several times we read that *qṣp* gave rise to the exile. Despite Yahweh's anger, there is still hope expressed that

---

7. G. Hentschel, *2 Könige. NEB* (1985), 60-61.

God will bring the exile to an end. Among the causes of God's anger we find "sin." The danger of perishing forever because God has forgotten (Lam. 5:20) leads the author to pray that Yahweh will restore (*šûḇ* hiphil) Israel. In the rhetorical question that follows (v. 22), which includes an element of "budding . . . confidence,"[8] utter rejection *(m's)* is equated with enduring anger (the interpretation of this verse as an embittered indictment of God[9] stretches the meaning of *qṣp;* the perfect serves to indicate facticity). Isa. 54:9 compares the exile of Israel to the days of Noah. As in that seemingly hopeless situation, Yahweh now promises never again to be angry with *(qṣp)* or rebuke *(g'r)* Israel. Trito-Isaiah's assurance of salvation gives hope to the downtrodden and oppressed (Isa. 57:15). This hope is grounded in the fact that God will no longer appear as an accuser *(rîḇ)* and will not always be angry *(qṣp).* Otherwise humankind would perish (expressed periphrastically with *rûaḥ* and *nᵉšāmâ*). God's anger *(qṣp)* was provoked by wickedness *('āwôn).*

Isa. 64:4 is fraught with textual difficulties;[10] but v. 4c, the immediate context of *qṣp,* presents no problems. In general the verse is a prayer that God *('ᵉlōhîm)* will sustain those who do right *('ōśê ṣeḏeq).* A survey of the past demonstrates that God's anger was justified, because the speakers have sinned *(ḥṭ').* But God is Father, and the speakers are like clay in the hands of a potter. To this God are addressed the plea not to be angry *('al-tiqṣōp)* forever and not to remember iniquity *('āwôn)* forever (v. 8[9]).

In religio-cultic contexts, *qṣp* occasionally has limited negative consequences. Dt. 9:22 recalls the rebellions at Taberah, Massah, and Kibroth-hattaavah that provoked Yahweh to anger (*qṣp* hiphil); no negative consequences are described. Nor are there any consequences to Moses' anger over the superfluous manna that was gathered contrary to his instructions and became foul (Ex. 16:20). Moses was angry with Eleazar and Ithamar because (again contrary to Moses' command) they had burned the flesh of the sin offering instead of eating it (Lev. 10:16).

It appears that other expressions clearly exceed *qṣp* in intensity. According to Dt. 9:7, Israel's conduct provoked Yahweh to anger (*qṣp* hiphil). The negative dimension increased, leading at Horeb to wrath (*'np* hithpael), so that Yahweh was ready to destroy his people. For forty days and nights, Moses fasted in Yahweh's presence on account of the sin *(ḥaṭṭā'ṯ)* the people had committed against Yahweh (v. 18, referring to the calf [v. 21]), thus vexing (*k's* hiphil) him. Now Moses feared Yahweh's wrath *('aḇ)* and fury *(ḥēmâ).* Yahweh was so angry *(qṣp)* that he was ready to destroy (*šmd* hiphil) his people.

Other passages express more clearly the threat of destruction inherent in *qṣp.* The people grumbled in the wilderness, even though God was guiding them; their complaints angered (*qṣp,* Dt. 1:34) Yahweh, who swore that not one of the evil generation should see the promised land. When Moses went to meet the Israelites returning from battle with the Midianites, he became angry (*qṣp,* Nu. 31:14) with the commanders of

8. H. J. Boecker, *ZBK* 21, 95.
9. O. Kaiser, *Die Klagelieder. ATD* XVI/2 (³1981), 384.
10. L. Köhler, *Der Prophet der Heimkehr.* II (Copenhagen, 1934), 24-25.

the various units because they had not carried out the ban by slaying the women, who were responsible for making the Israelites act treacherously in the affair of Peor (vv. 16-17). His new instructions define more narrowly the groups to be killed (vv. 17-18). In this context *qṣp* is the motive force that leads to terrible and categorical consequences.

Some texts demonstrate that *qṣp* can have consequences that affect not just those who are the cause of the anger but others as well. This does not imply that *qṣp* possesses a sphere of influence that takes effect automatically: it is always Yahweh who has sovereign control over this dynamic. Ps. 106:32 refers to Meribah, rather surprisingly in this context.[11] There the conduct of the Israelites aroused (Yahweh's) anger *(qṣp),* with the result that God treated Moses ill on their account *(ba'ᵃḇûr).*

In Nu. 16:21 Yahweh commands Moses and Aaron to separate themselves from the congregation so that he may consume (*klh* piel) the people. V. 22 raises the crucial issue: one person has sinned *(ḥṭ'),* but anger *(qṣp)* engulfs the entire congregation as an expression of God's will to destroy them.[12]

The building of an altar by the Transjordanian tribes (Josh. 22:10ff.) is condemned by the rest as reprehensible apostasy. A temporal sequence is clearly visible: today *(hayyôm)* they rebel and tomorrow *(māḥār)* Yahweh will be angry (*qṣp,* v. 18) with the (whole) congregation *('ēḏâ).* V. 20 cites the example of Achan, who as a single individual brought Yahweh's anger *(qeṣep)* upon the congregation *('ēḏâ).* According to Lev. 10:6, ministry in the sanctuary prohibits the rituals of mourning. Failure to obey this injunction is punished by death and burning. But the entire congregation *('ēḏâ)* would also be victims of God's anger at the disobedient priests.

b. *Noun.* Some of the occurrences of the noun show that *qeṣep* (anger) can be provoked without a clear statement of the consequences. For example, the leaders of the entire congregation *('ēḏâ)* realize that they have bound themselves by an oath and therefore cannot attack the Gibeonites: to do so would bring *qeṣep* upon themselves (Josh. 9:20). Because Jehoshaphat helped the wicked man (probably Ahab) and thus showed love *('hb)* to those who hated *(śōnᵉ'îm)* Yahweh, anger *(qeṣep)* befell the king (2 Ch. 19:2). The text does not mention any consequences. Jehoshaphat's charge concerning the administration of justice (2 Ch. 19:9-10)[13] requires that, in a case *(rîḇ)* arising from the *tôrâ* of Yahweh, every effort must be made not to incur guilt and provoke anger *(qeṣep).*

Although Hezekiah was healed by a miraculous sign *(môp̱ēṯ)* from God when he was mortally ill, he responded with pride instead of gratitude. Therefore anger came upon him and upon Judah and Jerusalem (2 Ch. 32:25). But then the king and the inhabitants of Jerusalem humbled themselves, and so they did not fall victim to Yahweh's wrathful judgment in Hezekiah's days (v. 26). The potential for negative consequences is inherent in *qeṣep;* those who anger Yahweh suffer these conse-

11. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1989), 321.
12. E. Aurelius, *Die Fürbitte Israels. CBOT* 27 (1988), 186-202.
13. H. Niehr, *Herrschen und Richten. FzB* 54 (1986), 293-94.

quences if he gives his anger free rein. Yahweh's absolute sovereignty over the outcome is clear.

The author of Ps. 38 saw in *qeṣep* and *ḥēmâ* the reason for Yahweh's rebuke and discipline (*ykḥ, ysr,* v. 2[1]). It is clear that *qeṣep* can cause physical pain and psychological damage. Vv. 4-5(3-4) describe God's hostility as indignation *(za'am),* provoked by the psalmist's sin *(ḥaṭṭā't)* and iniquity *('āwôn).* It would be correct to describe *qeṣep* as a drastic manifestation of God's displeasure, which nevertheless does not intend destruction. The real aim of *qeṣep* and *ḥēmâ* is to elicit self-knowledge.

We also find *qeṣep* in contexts dealing with the theology of history. During the siege of Jerusalem in the time of Zedekiah's reign, the king inquired of Jeremiah concerning the seriousness of the situation. Jeremiah responded with a prophecy of disaster, in which Yahweh declares that he himself will fight (*lḥm* niphal) against Judah. This threat is qualified by a series of expressions: with an outstretched hand and a mighty arm, in wrath *('ap),* fury *(ḥēmâ),* and great anger (*qeṣep gāḏôl,* Jer. 21:5). It is clear here that the expressions expanding on *'ap* are less dire; *gāḏôl* is added to reinforce *qeṣep.* The consequence of Yahweh's action will be sword and pestilence. The implication of destruction is clear. Yahweh's wrath was kindled (*wayyiḥar-'ap,* Dt. 29:26[27]) because Israel had bowed down to worship other gods. The consequences are a curse *(qᵉlālâ)* and expulsion from the land in *'ap, ḥēmâ,* and *qeṣep gāḏôl.* In this formulaic series *qeṣep* by itself appears not to make a sufficiently strong semantic contribution: it must be intensified with *gāḏôl.*

Isa. 54:8, too, ascribes the exile to a brief outpouring of Yahweh's anger *(qeṣep)* in which he refused to come to his people's aid. The intensity of Yahweh's inclination to destroy Israel's communion with him finds clear expression in the contrast with *ḥeseḏ, rḥm,* and *gō'ēl.* Here, however, Yahweh's *qeṣep* is limited temporally to a transitory role. In Isa. 60:10 anger *(qeṣep)* is clearly instrumental to the act of "striking" (*nkh* hiphil) as a form of punishment. It is contravened, however, by *rāṣôn* and *rḥm* piel, the loving favor God shows his people after the period of the exile. The promise of deliverance in Jer. 32:36-37 begins with the negative situation: God has given Israel into the hand of the king of Babylon by sword, famine, and pestilence. The emotional instruments were wrath *('ap),* fury *(ḥēmâ),* and *qeṣep* (again intensified by *gāḏôl).*

There are other instances where *qeṣep* has dire consequences. Ps. 102 is a lament that contains a description of the psalmist's afflictions; the catalog of woes states that they were all unleashed by Yahweh's indignation *(za'am)* and anger *(qeṣep)* (v. 11a[10a]), making clear that *qeṣep* leads to punishment (v. 11b[10b]). The image of God's lifting up the psalmist and throwing him aside is startling in its savagery.

Social injustice can also provoke *qeṣep.* Zec. 7 accuses the land and the priests (v. 5) of oppressing widows, orphans, aliens, and the poor, of devising evil, and of stopping their ears to the prophets' call to repent (vv. 10-11). Therefore great anger *(qeṣep gāḏôl)* came upon them. The first consequence is Yahweh's refusal to hear their cries; the second, the scattering of the people and the desolation of the land.

According to Nu. 17:6-15(16:41-50), the congregation assembled against Moses and Aaron and turned against the tent of meeting (17:7[16:42]). The ensuing punishment goes forth (*yāṣā',* 17:11[16:46]) from Yahweh in the form of anger *(qeṣep),* and

consists in a terrible blow (*negep;* NRSV "plague") that leaves many dead (17:12ff.[16:47ff.]). Cultic purification (*kipper,* 17:12[16:47]), however, saves the lives of others.

We find formulaic references to the consequences of *qeṣep* and its effect on others. Nu. 1:53 requires the Levites to camp around the *miškan hā'ēḏûṯ* to prevent *qeṣep* from coming upon the congregation of the Israelites. If the Levites perform the duties of the sanctuary and the duties of the altar, anger *(qeṣep)* will not come upon the Israelites (Lev. 18:4-5).

According to 1 Ch. 27:23, David took a census of all the Israelites aged twenty and above; when Joab began to count those below the age of twenty, he could not finish the task because the anger *(qeṣep)* provoked by David had come upon Israel. The only consequence of this anger is failure to complete the census. At the behest of leading Judahites, King Joash permitted sacred poles and idols to be set up; therefore anger came upon Judah and Jerusalem (2 Ch. 24:18). The consequences of this anger are not described. When Yahweh sent prophets to persuade the people to return to him, they refused to listen. When warned by the priest Zechariah, they stoned him. The consequence was a war with the Arameans, which Joash and Judah lost. The author views this disaster as divine judgment (*šᵉpāṭîm,* probably an intensive plural). The whole scenario demonstrates that *qeṣep,* although it denotes a grave manifestation of anger, is nowhere near as dire and momentous as *šepeṭ.*

Others can feel the negative effects of *qeṣep.* When the king of the Edomites found himself in a desperate military situation against Israel, he sacrificed his firstborn son (2 K. 3:27), and *qeṣep gāḏôl* came upon Israel. It is interesting that it was the people of Yahweh who suffered the consequences of this anger rather than the king of the Edomites, who in the view of the Israelites had acted unjustly. Israel had to withdraw from the battle. The reform movement under Hezekiah emerged because the people had turned away from God and neglected the temple cult; the anger (*qeṣep,* 2 Ch. 29:8) of Yahweh had therefore come upon Judah and Jerusalem. The consequence was destruction and captivity (v. 9).

3. *Foreign Nations.* The root *qṣp* takes on a particular intensity when associated with foreign nations. We may observe that the meaning becomes increasingly drastic in later texts. Even though the central theological concern of demonstrating Yahweh's divinity remains implicit, ferocity is very much in evidence.

Jer. 10:10 describes Yahweh as sovereign over the whole world: he is the true God, Lord of life and everlasting King, whose supremacy knows no temporal bounds. This sovereignty undermines all earthly powers: at his anger *(qeṣep)* the earth quakes, and the nations cannot endure his indignation *(za'am).* God's *qeṣep* is instrumental in demonstrating his ascendancy.

Zec. 1:12-17, which has affinities with Deutero-Isaiah,[14] is an oracle of comfort for Israel and disaster for Israel's oppressors. God promises to intervene with great zeal

---

14. C. Westermann, *Prophetische Heilsworte im AT. FRLANT* 145 (1987), 92-93.

(*qin'â,* v. 14b) on behalf of his people. Of equal emotional intensity and violence, though couched in negative terms, is Yahweh's rejection of the nations that sought to abet him in punishing Israel (*qeṣep gāḏôl . . . qōṣēp,* v. 15). Since the consequences are not specified, it would be wrong to read into the text more than it states: with concentrated emotional energy, Yahweh rejects those who live in false security. The language is remarkably emphatic. Jer. 50:13 vividly describes the dire consequences of *qeṣep yhwh:* Babylon will not be inhabited but will become an utter desolation.

The nations and indeed the whole world are summoned before the bar. The trial, cosmic in dimension, is occasioned by the *qeṣep lᵉyhwh* and *ḥēmâ* (Isa. 34:2), but one looks in vain for anything more specific. "[The author] simply sees that the measuring cup of guilt is filled to the full, and he considers it immaterial to furnish any details."[15] The use of *lᵉ* to associate *qeṣep* with Yahweh shows that we are actually dealing with a direct confrontation between God and the nations (the context focuses only on Edom). Here *qeṣep* is God's stimulus to punish; the consequences and results are horrific. The nations are destined for doom and slaughter. The slain will not even be buried, and the mountains will flow with blood.

Reiterer

15. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 2002), 329.

קָצַץ *qāṣaṣ*

I. Etymology. II. Usage: 1. Survey; 2. Qal; 3. Piel and Pual. III. LXX.

I. Etymology. The root *qṣṣ* is clearly onomatopoetic. Its basic meaning is probably something like "rub, grind, grate." This meaning can still be seen in the Akkadian verb *kaṣāṣu(m)/gāṣaṣu,* "whet, grind one's teeth."[1] The D stem means "cut, trim, prune." This meaning also appears in other languages: Ugar. *qṣ, qṣṣ,* "cut, slaughter";[2] OSA *mqṣm,* "felling";[3] Arab. *qaṣṣa,* "cut (off), shave, prune." Heb. *qāṣaṣ* also belongs in this semantic group: the qal means "cut off, cut down," the piel "cut off, cut to pieces." The root is probably related to the verb *qṣh,* which exhibits a similar meaning in the piel: "cut or break off, separate into pieces."

qāṣaṣ. V. Schacht, *"ḳiṣaṣ," Encyclopédie de l'Islam,* V (1980), 174-77.

1. *AHw,* I, 457-58; cf. *CAD,* G, 52-53.
2. *WUS,* no. 2434; *UT,* no. 2259.
3. W. W. Müller, *ZAW* 75 (1963) 314.

II. Usage. 1. *Survey.* The verb *qāṣaṣ* appears mostly in narrative texts (8 times); it also appears once in a legal text (Dt. 25:12). Of its four occurrences in prophetic books, three are in a periphrastic expression referring to an ethnic group (Jer. 9:25[Eng. 26]; 25:23; 49:32); the fourth (Hab. 2:10) reflects textual emendation. Finally, the two occurrences in the Psalms (46:10[9]; 129:4) are the only instances where Yahweh is the subject of the action denoted by *qāṣaṣ*.

2. *Qal.* The qal of *qāṣaṣ* occurs only four times. The consequential clause of a casuistic law (Dt. 25:12) requires that, if a woman intervenes in a fight between two men and seizes the genitals of her husband's opponent, her hand shall be cut off. Her act appears to represent an extraordinarily serious transgression: nowhere else in OT law — apart from the *ius talionis* — is mutilation laid down as a punishment.

Jer. 9:24-25(25-26) and 25:15-26 are oracles of judgment against the nations; 49:28-33 comprises utterances dealing with individual Arabian tribes. All these texts use the term *qᵉṣûṣê pē'â,* "those with shaven temples" (9:25[26]; 25:23; 49:32) to denote a group of Arabian tribes who "live in the desert" (9:25[26]; 25:23-24). The phrase refers to the custom practiced by certain Arabian tribes, attested elsewhere as well,[4] of shaving off the hair covering their temples. Because this custom has religious significance, it is prohibited in Israel (Lev. 19:27, using the hiphil of *nqp*).

3. *Piel and Pual.* The majority of occurrences are in the piel (11) and pual (once). Like the qal in Dt. 25:12, the piel of *qṣṣ* refers several times to the cutting off of parts of the body; according to Jenni,[5] the focus of interest is not so much on the act itself as on its results, the severed members. A historically obscure account in Jgs. 1:5-7 records that the Judahites cut off the thumbs and big toes of Adoni-bezek, apparently a king of Jerusalem, whom they had defeated and captured (v. 6). This mutilation was clearly intended to render the enemy unfit for combat in the future. V. 7 uses the pual participle to relate this act anecdotally to the treatment Adoni-bezek himself had meted out to seventy kings. In 2 S. 4:12 the severing of bodily parts plays a different role. Here it is the killers of Ishbaal whose hands and feet are cut off, clearly an act of postmortem profanation to punish the parts of the body that played the central role in the crime.

Another group of occurrences involves texts that record damage to the appurtenances of the Jerusalem temple. Here *qṣṣ* appears to cover a wide range of meanings, from "break off" to "break to pieces, dismantle." In 2 K. 16:17 the action affects the moldings on the stands for the wheeled basins, which were clearly made of precious metal. Ahaz probably stripped the stands to raise tribute for the Assyrian emperor. The Chronicler's version of the incident has completely reshaped the original: the smashing of the temple utensils demonstrates the idolatry of Ahaz; it was part of his attempt to suppress the worship of Yahweh in the temple in favor of new altars to other gods (2 C. 28:24). A similar violation of the temple fabric is recorded in 2 K. 18:16. It was occa-

4. Herodotus, *Hist.* 3.8.
5. *HP,* 185.

sioned by the tribute King Hezekiah had to pay Sennacherib. The doors and presumably also the doorposts *('ōmᵉnôṯ)* of the temple were the object of this action. They were clearly dismantled (*qṣṣ* piel) to strip the wooden core of its metal overlay.

Somewhat different in nature is 2 K. 24:13, a verse almost universally judged secondary to its context. After the capitulation of Jehoiachin in 597 B.C.E., Nebuchadnezzar plundered the temple and smashed all the cultic vessels made of gold. Here too the verb indicates (violent) breaking into pieces.

Only one text uses *qṣṣ* in the context of metalworking. In the account of the making of the priestly vestments, Ex. 39:3 (P) describes the manufacture of gold threads by cutting gold leaf into strips. This verse represents an addition to the basic account in Ex. 28:6-12.

The versions support the suggestion that the original text of Hab. 2:10 had a form of *qṣṣ*. In the setting of a woe oracle,[6] Babylon is charged with having "dismembered" many peoples. This probably alludes to the deportations carried out by the Babylonians, which tore mature peoples and nations asunder.

In Ps. 46:10(9) and 129:4 Yahweh is the subject of *qṣṣ*. Ps. 129 is a communal psalm of praise; in the context of a retrospective survey of Yahweh's saving acts, the psalm affirms that he has cut the "cords of the wicked," i.e., the oppression and degradation of Israel at the hands of its enemies. In Ps. 46, a Zion psalm, v. 10(9) frames a statement about the nature of Yahweh, who "makes wars cease to the end of the earth, who breaks *(šbr)* bows, shatters (*qṣṣ* piel) spears, and burns chariots with fire." This statement is part of a broad stream of tradition that speaks of God's destruction of weapons.[7] The other relevant texts generally use the verb → שׁבר *šbr;* only Ps. 46:10(9) juxtaposes *qṣṣ* with an almost identical sense ("shatter").

III. LXX. The LXX translates the qal of *qṣṣ* with forms of *apokóptein* and *(peri)keírein,* the piel and pual seven times with forms of *apo-/kata-/syn-kóptein.*

The root does not occur in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Thiel

---

6. On its origin see J. Jeremias, *Kultprophetie und Gerichtsverkündigung in der späten Königszeit Israels. WMANT* 35 (1970), 57-75.

7. R. Bach, "'. . . Der Bogen zerbricht, Spiesse zerschlägt und Wagen mit Feuer verbrennt,'" *Probleme biblischer Theologie. FS G. von Rad* (Munich, 1971), 13-26.

קָצַר *qāṣar* I; קָצִיר *qāṣîr*

I. Etymology. II. Occurrences. III. Usage: 1. Season; 2. Activity; 3. Cult and Law; 4. Theological Metaphor. IV. Sirach and Dead Sea Scrolls. V. LXX.

I. Etymology. The noun *qāṣîr* has almost no equivalents outside Hebrew, with the possible exception of Imperial Aram. *kṣyr.*[1] For the verb the evidence is more extensive. We may cite Can. *ka-*[*z*]*i-ra*[2] as well as Akk. *kaṣāru,* "knot, organize, gather,"[3] although Akk. *eṣēdu*[4] is more closely equivalent in meaning to *qāṣar.*[5] We also find Syr. *qeṭar,* Christian Palestinian *qṭr,* Mand. *GṬR,* and Eth. *qʷaṣara.* The verb *qāṣar* itself also appears twice in the Gezer Calendar,[6] as well as in Meṣad Ḥashavyahu in the context of a complaint that a cloak was taken during the harvest and a request to get it back.[7] The from *hqṣr* appears in Lachish Letter no. 5, in a wish that the recipient may enjoy a good harvest.[8]

Egypt worshiped the harvest as the divinity *šmw,* after whom one of the seasons was even named. Other ancient Near Eastern religions also established a close association between the harvest and the appropriate deities: growth and harvest demanded certain requirements in the lives of the gods as well as certain forms of the cult. Especially significant was the Canaanite notion of a dying and rising god, reflected in the dying and rebirth of vegetation.[9]

---

qāṣar I. A. van den Born, "Ernte," *BL*², 423-24; A. Deimel, "Ackerbau in sumerischer Zeit," *RLA,* I, 16-18; *idem,* "Ackerwirtschaft in sumerischer Zeit," *RLA,* I, 18-19; H. Gese, in *idem,* M. Höfner, and K. Rudolph, *Die Religionen Altsyriens, Altarabiens und die Mandäer. RM* 10/2 (1970), 3-232; W. Guglielmi, "Ernte," *LexÄg,* I, 1271-72; J. Halbe, *Das Privilegrecht Jahwes Ex 34,10-26. FRLANT* 114 (1975), esp. 185-94; F. Hauck, "θερίζω," *TDNT,* III, 132-33; A. Hermann, "Ernte, A. Nichtchristlich, I. Alter Orient," *RAC,* VI, 275-91; A. S. Kapelrud, "Ernte," *BHHW,* I, 433; O. Keel, M. Küchler, and C. Uehlinger, *Orte und Landschaften der Bibel,* I (1984), esp. 52; R. Knierim, "Ackerbau, Ackerbaufeste," *Calwer Bibellexikon* (Stuttgart, ⁵1959), 14-18; K. Koch, "Gibt es ein Vergeltungsdogma im AT?" *Um das Prinzip der Vergeltung in Religion und Recht des ATs. WdF* 125 (1972), 130-80 (repr. from *ZTK* 52 [1955] 1-42); B. Meissner, "Ackerbau und Ackerwirtschaft in babylonischer und assyrischer Zeit," *RLA,* I, 19-21; D. Pardee, *Handbook of Ancient Hebrew Letters. SBLSBS* 15 (Chico, 1982); K. A. D. Smelik, *Writings from Ancient Israel* (Eng. trans. Louisville, 1991); H. te Velde, "Erntezeremonien," *LexÄg,* II, 1-4.

1. *DISO,* 126.
2. EA 244:14.
3. *AHw,* I, 456-57.
4. *AHw,* I, 250-51.
5. *HAL,* III, 1126.
6. *KAI,* 182.I.4-5; cf. Smelik, 93-100.
7. *KAI,* 200.3-4,6,9-10; cf. Pardee, 20-21; Smelik, 93-100.
8. *KAI,* 195.8; cf. Pardee, 96-97; Smelik, 118.
9. See Gese, esp. 74, 135, 195, and the texts cited there.

II. Occurrences. The Hebrew root *qṣr* denotes the semantic complex "harvest," both as action and result. It appears accordingly both as a verb and as a noun. The verb occurs 19 times in the OT (Lev. 19:9; 23:10,22; 25:5,11; Dt. 24:19; Ruth 2:9; 1 S. 6:13; 8:12; 2 K. 19:29; Job 4:8; 24:6; Ps. 126:5; Prov. 22:8; Eccl. 11:4; Isa. 17:5; 37:30; Jer. 12:13; Hos. 8:7; 10:12,13; Mic. 6:15). There are also 10 occurrences of the nominalized ptcp. *qōṣēr* (Ruth 2:3,4,5,6,7,14; 2 K. 4:18; Ps. 129:7; Jer. 9:21[Eng. 22]; Am. 9:13). The noun *qāṣîr* occurs 43 times (Gen. 8:22; 30:14; 45:6; Ex. 23:16; 34:21,22; Lev. 19:9; 23:10,22; 25:5; Dt. 24:19; Josh. 3:15; Jgs. 15:1; Ruth 1:22; 2:21,23; 1 S. 6:13; 8:12; 12:17; 2 S. 21:9 [twice],10; 23:13; Job 5:5; Prov. 6:8; 10:5; 25:13; 26:1; Isa. 9:2[3]; 16:9; 17:5; 18:4,5; 23:3; Jer. 5:17,24; 8:20; 50:16; 51:33; Hos. 6:11; Joel 1:11; 4:13[3:13]; Am. 4:7). Possibly Jer. 48:32 should also be included, for several mss. read *qāṣîr* instead of the *BHS* reading *bāṣîr.* It is quite conceivable that the close similarity to Isa. 16:9 caused a change in the text.

Quite striking is the use of *qāṣîr* in combination or in parallel with → קיץ *qayiṣ* in Gen. 8:22; Prov. 6:8; 10:5; 26:1; Isa. 16:9; Jer. 8:20; 48:32(?), which suggests a close semantic relationship between the two nouns. We also find *qṣr* in combination with → חרשׁ *ḥrš* (Gen. 45:6; 1 S. 8:12; Job 4:8; Prov. 20:4; Hos. 10:13; Am. 9:13).[10] Especially common is the association of *qṣr* with → זרע *zr'* (Gen. 8:22; Ex. 23:16; Lev. 25:11; Job 4:8; Ps. 126:5; Prov. 22:8; Eccl. 11:4; Isa. 23:3; Jer. 12:13; 50:16; Hos. 8:7; 10:12,13; Mic. 6:15), emphasizing that sowing is requisite for reaping.

III. Usage.

1. *Season.* The noun *qāṣîr* is used in a purely temporal sense in Gen. 30:14; Josh. 3:15; Jgs. 15:1; Ruth 1:22; 2 S. 21:9,10; 23:13, associating an event with the time of harvest (wheat or barley), roughly May to August.[11] Besides referring to the harvest season, 1 S. 6:13 includes the activity of reaping, expressed by the verb *qāṣar.* The time of the (wheat) harvest is also mentioned by 1 S. 12:17, but the thunderstorm that acts as a sign validating the prophet's message would be highly unusual during the harvest season.[12] Prov. 25:13 also does more than simply name the season: the benefit of a trustworthy messenger is compared to the refreshment provided by snow on a (hot) day in harvest time.[13] In Isa. 18:4,5; Jer. 8:20; and Am. 4:7, although the temporal aspect appears to be central, in each case the context shows that other perspectives are critical. In this usage, therefore, it is already clear that even when the text simply mentions the concrete action of harvesting, it suggests other associations.

2. *Activity.* The activity of harvesting is expressed by the participial noun *qōṣēr,* which refers to the men who harvest the grain. Isa. 17:5 suggests how this action was carried out: "The harvester gathers a bunch of the stalks with his left arm, using the

---

10. Cf. J. Khanjian, *RSP,* II, 396, no. 41.
11. For further details on the time of harvest and how it proceeded, see Dalman, *AuS,* III, 1-66.
12. On the expression *yrḥ qṣr š'rym,* cf. the Gezer Calendar (*KAI,* 182.I.4).
13. B. Lang, *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. H. Cazelles. AOAT* 212 (1981), 219-32.

sickle with his right hand to cut the grain off."[14] Ruth 2:9; 1 S. 8:12; Job 24:6; Eccl. 11:4; and possibly Ps. 126:5 refer to harvesting in the literal sense. In summary we may say that *qṣr* refers to all the actions that must be performed to harvest grain.

The concrete activity of harvesting is also mentioned in Ruth 2:21 and 1 S. 8:12. The latter text, which also speaks of the crop to be harvested, appears in a passage that lists the prerogatives of the king: the negative aspects culminate in his enlisting the sons of the citizens to reap his harvest, effectively requiring slave labor. Isa. 23:3 alludes to the harvest made possible by the waters of the Nile. Gen. 45:6 declares that there will be five more years of famine, during which there will be neither plowing nor harvest. According to Job 24:6, by night the wicked reap the harvest of fields belonging to others.

Isa. 9:2(3) speaks positively of the joy occasioned by the harvest (cf. also Ps. 4:8[7]; 126:6). Isa. 16:9, however, contrasts the joyous shouts of the invading enemy to the anticipated rejoicing over the harvest, which will not take place (cf. also Jer. 48:32).

This strictly literal usage is left behind in Isa. 18:4-5, where the mention of the harvest (in the context of an oracle concerning Ethiopia, vv. 1-8) serves only to make clear Yahweh's intent to maintain a watchful distance from earthly events, only to intervene unexpectedly when the battle is joined. The two following texts also speak of a literal harvest, but for the purpose of describing more graphically the circumstances of a fool: Job 5:5 laments that fools and their children have their harvest eaten by a hungry stranger; Prov. 26:1 declares that honor is as inappropriate to a fool as rain in harvest.

In Prov. 6:8; 10:5; 20:4, *qāṣîr* is virtually synonymous with hard work: the industrious are recognized by their diligence at harvest time. In a similar vein Eccl. 11:4 cautions against being distracted by the wind and the clouds and thus missing seed time and harvest. Here too the text clearly advocates action.

In 2 K. 19:29 par. Isa. 37:30, Hezekiah (who may represent eschatological Jerusalem[15]) is called upon to sow and reap in the third year after the catastrophe. Here as elsewhere *qṣr* appears in combination with *zrʿ* and thus represents the delayed result of sowing. It remains an open question, however, whether these verses transcend the literal meaning, so that "sowing" and "reaping" address the situation of the Jewish people, ultimately representing the restoration of Judah.[16]

3. *Cult and Law.* Joel 1:11 bewails the devastation of the harvest because offerings can no longer be presented to the sanctuary and probably also because the failure of the harvest is viewed as the failure of God's blessing (Joel 2:14).[17] Lev. 23:10 also speaks of an offering of the harvest, requiring that its firstfruits be presented to the priests. The initial crop is thus considered an offering to the deity.

The mention of harvest festivals shows clearly that Yahweh and the harvest are intimately related. Ex. 23:16 names as the second festival in the festal calendar (vv. 14-16)

14. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1997), 171.
15. O. Kaiser, *Jesaja. ATD* XVIII (1981), 314.
16. *Ibid.,* 315; H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 2002), 430.
17. H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1977), 32.

the *ḥag haqqāṣîr,* which appears elsewhere as the Feast of Weeks *(ḥag šāḇu'ôṯ),* making clear the authentically agrarian background of the festival. Ex. 34:22 also commands observance of the festival with the firstfruits of the wheat harvest; here, however, it is already called *ḥag šāḇu'ôṯ.* Ex. 32:21 also deals with this festival, requiring observance of the sabbath even in plowing time and harvest time (v. 21b). According to Halbe,[18] the real point of this verse is the obligation of farmers to observe the Sabbath, since the two terms *ḥārîš* and *qāṣîr* constitute a hendiadys for agricultural labor in general. Even if v. 21b is a secondary addition, however, the emphatic formulation of the verse is striking; it is more likely, therefore, that other scholars are correct in interpreting the verse as a call to respect the Sabbath even during times of the most demanding and necessary work.[19]

The sabbatical year for the land is the subject of Lev. 25:5. Seed that sprouts of its own accord is not to be harvested but left for slaves, aliens, etc., to gather. A similar prohibition applies during the Jubilee Year (Lev. 25:11), though without an analogous social motivation. Lev. 19:9; 23:22; Dt. 24:19 reflect a similar social context: they forbid gathering the gleanings of the harvest, so as to give the poor a chance. The original, pre-Israelite religious motivation for this behavior (leaving part of the harvest to satisfy or accommodate the demon of the field) has been superseded by a requirement of social ethics. The story of Ruth provides a detailed description of how the requirements of these texts were realized (cf. Ruth 2:9).

In Gen. 8:2 Yahweh appears as guarantor of the harvest, promising that the rhythm of seedtime and harvest, like that of summer and winter, will not cease as long as the earth endures. A similar notion appears in Jer. 5:24, which attempts to inspire fear of Yahweh by an appeal to the guaranteed order of creation.

4. *Theological Metaphor.* In Prov. 22:8; Job 4:8; Hos. 8:7; 10:10-11, harvesting is joined with sowing or plowing in the context of the connection between actions and their consequences. Texts influenced by wisdom ideology use the harvest image to give expression to the consequences of human conduct: it is noteworthy that they mention only the negative consequences of negative conduct. Hos. 8:7 adds an element of augmentation to the image: those who sow the wind reap the whirlwind. This association of seed and harvest with human fortunes shows quite clearly that an unhappy lot is a consequence implicit in an action, not retribution.[20]

Ps. 126:5 also illustrates a connection between sowing and reaping, contrasting the weeping as seed time with the joy of the harvest. It is hard to determine whether this verse actually suggests ritual weeping and rejoicing during sowing and reaping, echoing the Canaanite cult of the dying and rising fertility god;[21] this theory does not appear to fit the Israelite situation,[22] especially since the text in question does not deal with

18. Pp. 190-91.
19. E.g., M. Noth, *Exodus. ATD* V (1988), 217; F. Michaeli, *CAT* 2, 288.
20. Koch, esp. 141-48.
21. F. Hvidberg, "Vom Weinen und Lachen im AT," *ZAW* 57 (1939) 150-52; H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1989), 450-51; A. A. Anderson, *Psalms. NCBC* (1981), 856-57.
22. *AuS,* III, 43-44.

concrete agricultural activities. Instead, sowing and reaping refer to the fate of Israel, so that we can clearly observe the association sketched above.

In oracles of judgment the root *qṣr* occurs in Isa. 17:5; 18:4,5; Jer. 5:17; 12:13; 48:32; 50:16; 51:33; Joel 4:13(3:13); Am. 4:7; Mic. 6:15. Among other things, it expresses the circumstance that external events (e.g., an enemy invasion) have reduced the nation to almost nothing, resembling a harvested field. In such contexts "harvest" is clearly a theological metaphor. The image describes Israel in Isa. 17:5 and Jer. 5:17; it represents the fate of the nations in the apocalyptic imagery of Joel 4:13(3:13), where the harvest is a covert symbol of God's final judgment. The oracle of judgment against Babylon in Jer. 50 calls for vengeance: the rural population is to be wiped out, so that there can be no sowing or reaping (v. 16). Jer. 51:33 announces the coming of harvest time as a judgment on Babylon.

Am. 4:7 accuses the people of having failed to return to Yahweh even though he has punished them by withholding rain until three months before the harvest. Mic. 6:15 threatens that the enemy, not those who sowed the seed, will harvest the grain.

The harvest also plays a role in laments. Jer. 8:20 laments that, though the harvest has come and gone, the people have not been saved (by Yahweh). Jer. 12:13 expresses dismay that instead of the wheat that was sown only thorns will be harvested, because the enemy have pillaged the land. Isa. 16:9 and analogously Jer. 48:32 bewail the lack of a harvest for Moab, again because of devastation by the enemy. Each of these texts understands the absence of the harvest as Yahweh's judgment.

An even more vivid use of the harvest as a symbol of Yahweh's judgment or punishment appears in Jer. 9:21(22). Following a battle, the slain lie like sheaves behind the reaper. The text lays the foundation for the commonplace of death as the "grim reaper." We note, therefore, that both sowing and reaping were so critical for the population of this period that oracles of judgment as well as laments could use the root *qṣr* as a synonym for a physical or political danger facing the people. In contrast to the positive overtones of *qṣr* in literal, agricultural usage, theologically oriented contexts generally use *qṣr* in a negative sense, standing for destruction, punishment, or a negative consequence.

The intimate relationship between *qṣr* and national survival is also clear in Hos. 6:11, an oracle promising salvation that should probably be considered a secondary addition. Here, as in Jeremiah, *qāṣîr* is used as a term for judgment, albeit with salvific overtones that point to the future and suggest at the same time the promise of a (new) harvest. A similar observation can be made with respect to Am. 9:13, also secondary. This verse promises an extraordinary harvest, indeed a coalescence of seedtime and harvest, thus providing a glimpse of life in the eschaton.

IV. Sirach and Dead Sea Scrolls. Like Hos. 8:7 and with a similar use of augmentation, Sir. 7:3 discusses actions and their consequences: the (evil) seed yields an enormous harvest. The exact meaning of Sir. 6:19 is unclear.[23]

---

23. G. Sauer, *JSHRZ* III/5, 520 n. 19a.

The Dead Sea Scrolls use *qāṣîr* in a temporal sense in combination with *qayiṣ* in 1QS 10:7 and in a series of festivals in 4Q512 4:3. The verb appears also in 4Q504 7:6, and quite likely in 4Q186 fr. 1, 3:5, and fr. 2, 1:4.

V. LXX. The LXX generally uses *therízein* to translate the verb *qṣr* and either *ámētos* or *therismós* to translate *qāṣîr.* No particular thematic focus appears in LXX usage.

Hausmann

קָצַר *qāṣar* II; קָצֵר *qāṣēr;* קֹצֶר *qōṣer*

I. 1. Occurrences; 2. Extrabiblical Occurrences; 3. LXX; 4. Meaning. II. OT: 1. Qal; 2. Other Stems; 3. Noun and Adjective; 4. Classification of Texts. III. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. 1. *Occurrences.* The root *qṣr* II,[1] distinct from *qāṣar* I, "harvest," occurs 23 times in the OT. There are 17 occurrences of the verb *qāṣar* II (2 in Numbers, 2 in Judges, 1 in Job, 2 in Psalms, 1 in Proverbs, 2 in Sirach, 4 in Isaiah, 1 in Ezekiel, 1 in Micah, and 1 in Zechariah). There is a single occurrence of the noun *qōṣer* in Exodus, and there are 5 occurrences of the adj. *qāṣēr* (1 in 2 Kings par. Isaiah, 1 in Job, and 2 in Proverbs).

2. *Extrabiblical Occurrences.* This root probably appears in the Semitic name of an Asiatic slave in New Kingdom Egypt: *qa-ṣ( )r-jʿa,* "the short."[2] The only other prebiblical occurrences are in Ugaritic texts.[3] One fragmentary text uses the verb in ll. 33-34: *tqṣrn*( ) ymy,* "my days will be short" or (less likely) in the D stem, ". . . shorten the days of their lord"; the substantive appears in l. 10: *w*in qṣr (t . . .),* "and no contraction"; either the substantive or the verb appears in l. 39: *wqṣrt pʿn,* "and

qāṣar II. K. Aartun, *Die Partikeln des Ugaritischen,* II. *AOAT* 21/2 (1978), 93; W. Baumgartner, "Beiträge zum hebräischen Lexikon," *FS O. Eissfeldt. BZAW* 77 (²1961), 25-31; M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín, "Die keilalphabetische *šumma izbu*-Text RS 24.247 + 265 + 268 + 328," *UF* 7 (1975) 133-46; *idem,* "Lexikalische und literarische Probleme in RS 1.2 = CTA 32 und RS 17.100 = CTA Appendice I," *UF* 7 (1975) 147-55; R. D. Haak, "A Study and New Interpretation of QṢR NPŠ," *JBL* 101 (1982) 161-67; L. Prijs, "Ergänzungen zum talmudisch-hebräischen Wörterbuch," *ZDMG* 120 (1970) 6-29, esp. 13-14; W. Richter, *Untersuchungen zur Valenz althebräischer Verben 2. GBH, ʿMQ, QṢR II. ATS* 25 (1986), esp. 161-209; A. van Selms, "CTA 32: A Prophetic Liturgy," *UF* 3 (1971) 235-48.

1. *HAL,* III, 1126-27; *GesB,* 722.
2. Papyrus Anastasi I, 23, 6; W. Helck, *Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien* (Wiesbaden, 1962), 378; additional material in the 2d ed. (1971), 359.
3. For a survey see Richter, 207ff.; Haak, 161-62.

shortness of foot" or "his foot is short."[4] The verb frequently appears with *npš:* at the end of the Keret Epic,[5] the heir to the throne accuses his father: "You do not give justice to the widow and you do not judge the cause of the *qṣr npš,*" the afflicted[6] or the weak whose life is danger.[7] In a ritual text whose fragmentary state makes interpretation difficult,[8] the combination *bqṣrt npškm(-kn)* in parallel with *'p,* "anger,"[9] and *qṭt,* "loathing," denotes a negative emotional state, impatience or vexation,[10] which is considered sinful and must be expiated, whether by the inhabitants of Ugarit or for a wrong done them.[11]

In postbiblical usage the piel of the verb appears in Middle Hebrew and Jewish Aramaic, "make short"; Christian Palestinian, "be shortened, reduced"; Mand. *qṣr,* "be/make short"; Arab. *qaṣura,* "be/become short," *qaṣara,* "fail."[12] The noun is attested in Mand. *kṣurta,* "diminution, loss"; Arab. *quṣūr,* "inability, diminution, slackness"; the adjective appears in Middle Heb. *qāṣār/qāṣēr;* Jewish Aram. *quṣᵉrā',* "short, scant"; Christian Palestinian *qwṣr;* Syr. *qᵉṣīrā;* Mand. *kṣir(a),* "sick, disheartened"; Arab. *qaṣīr,* "short, small, lowly." Whether the Nabataean emphatic *qṣr',* "small chamber, cell," and the Punic abs. *qṣrt,* denoting a portion of a sacrifice, are connected with the root *qṣr* II seems dubious.[13]

3. *LXX.* The LXX renders the various aspects of diminution associated with *qṣr* II in several ways. For the spatial dimension it uses *stenochōreín* (Isa. 28:20). For *qṣr yd* it uses *ouk ischýein* (Isa. 50:2; 59:1) and *ouk exarkeín.* The different translations of the parallel texts 2 K. 19:26 *(ēsthénēsan tḗ cheirí)* and Isa. 37:27 *(anḗka tás cheíras)* are interesting. Most often we find a construction using *olígos:* for temporal diminution, *oligoún, oligótēs, oligóbios* (Prov. 10:27; Ps. 102:24[Eng. 23]; Job 14:1); we also find *eláttoun* (Sir. 30:24) and *smikrýnein* (Ps. 89:46[45]). In Nu. 21:4; Jgs. 16:16 (cf. also Jgs. 10:16) the LXX uses *oligopsycheín* for *qṣr npš,* in Sir. 7:10 for *qṣr* alone. In Ex. 6:9 *oligopsychía* represents the noun phrase *qōṣer rûaḥ;* in Prov. 14:29 *oligópsychos* represents the adjective phrase *qᵉṣar rûaḥ.* Other translations to express a negative affect are *oxýthymos* (Prov. 14:17: *qṣr 'pym*), *parorgízein* (Mic. 2:7: *qṣr rwḥ yhwh*), and *thymoún* (Job 21:4: *qṣr rwḥ*).

4. *Meaning.* The element of diminution ("be/make short") in its various aspects remains the fixed semantic core of *qṣr* II, in spatial, temporal, and metaphorical contexts;

---

4. *KTU,* 1.103; Dietrich et al., *UF* 7; Richter, 208 n. 66.
5. *KTU,* 1.16, VI, 33-34.
6. *WUS,* no. 2438.
7. Richter, 208 n. 69; Haak, 162.
8. *KTU,* 1.40, ll. 22,31-32; cf. also ll. 39-40 (partly reconstructed), 14-15 (all reconstructed).
9. *WUS,* no. 345; considered dubious by E. Johnson, *TDOT,* I, 351.
10. Aartun, 91: "depression."
11. For the former see Dietrich et al., *UF* 7, 147-55; for the latter see van Selms, 239-40: "in return for your vexation."
12. *HAL,* III, 1126-27.
13. See *DISO,* 262.

this holds true of the extrabiblical occurrences of the root and its use in OT constructions, as well as in the LXX.

II. OT.

1. *Qal.* The G stem (qal) of the verb occurs 12 times; it denotes a condition of being (too) short, usually in a secular sense. A spatial aspect appears in Isa. 28:20, in a oracle concerning the scoffers of Jerusalem, who will not long be able to hide from God's imminent judgment: "For the bed is too short to stretch oneself on it *(qāṣar . . . mēhiśtārēaʿ),* and the covering too narrow to wrap oneself in it." The pass. ptcp. *qᵉṣurôṯ* (Ezk. 42:5) in the description of the temple chambers in Ezekiel's vision of the new temple also belongs here: "But the upper chambers were foreshortened."[14]

In three texts that speak of the hand of Yahweh,[15] spatial and metaphorical understandings coalesce. In Isa. 50:2a Yahweh asks why no one was there when he came and why no one answered when he called. The rhetorical question that follows, underlined by use of *figura etymologica,* exposes Israel's doubts concerning Yahweh's power: "Is my hand really too short *(qāṣôr qāṣᵉrâ)* to redeem *(mippᵉḏûṯ),* and have I no power to deliver?" The reference in vv. 2b-3 to Yahweh's power over the waters and the clouds is both a response and an example. Isa. 59:1 attacks such doubts constructively: "See, the hand of Yahweh is not too short to save *(mēhôšîaʿ).*" It is instead Israel's iniquities that impede God's salvation (v. 2). The core of Nu. 11:23 derives from J;[16] Yahweh addresses Moses, who had doubted the promise of meat for the people: "Is Yahweh's hand too short? Now you shall see whether my word will come true for you or not." In contrast to Isa. 50:2 and 59:1, the verb is not qualified by *min* + infinitive.

Most common are constructions of *qṣr* II qal with *npš* or *rwḥ* describing a negative or diminished mental or emotional state of a human being or God (cf. Ugaritic usage[17]). Haak emphasizes — not without some justification — that the context helps determine the meaning of the combination. On the basis of the Ugaritic evidence, he distinguishes two meanings: weakness/affliction and impatience. In Job 21:4 Job seeks understanding for his conduct: "As for me, is my complaint addressed to mortals? Why should I not be impatient *(tiqṣar rûḥî)*?"[18] It would be hard, however, to rule out the nuance of Job's weakness.[19] Fohrer suggests merely shortness of breath.[20] Nu. 21:4b says of the Israelites as they set out to go around Edom by way of the Sea of Reeds *wattiqṣar nepeš-hāʿām baddāreḵ.* Once again, this expression should not be understood solely as a shortening of the people's *npš* in the sense of

---

14. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 393, 398-99; G. Fohrer and K. Galling, *Ezechiel. HAT* XIII (1955), 264. Richter, 206, calls it an adjective.

15. → VI, 422-23.

16. M. Noth, *Numeri. ATD* VII (1982), 74; G. W. Coats, *Rebellion in the Wilderness* (Nashville, 1968), 98.

17. See I.2 above.

18. Richter, 205; *HAL,* III, 1126-27; L. Alonso-Schökel and J. L. Sicre Díaz, *Job* (Madrid, 1983), 323; N. H. Tur-Sinai, *Book of Job* (Jerusalem, ²1967), 323.

19. Haak, 164.

20. G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 337.

impatience;[21] also present are undertones of weakness and exhaustion.[22] Jgs. 16:16 describes Samson's emotional reaction to Delilah's repeated attempts to discover his secret, qualified by an infinitive: *wattiqṣar napšô lāmûṯ,* "he was mortally impatient,"[23] or perhaps better, "he was mortally distressed."[24]

In Zec. 11:8, in the allegory of the shepherds, the prophet says in the context of a symbolic action: "And in one month I disposed of the three shepherds, and I became angry/indignant at them, and they also detested me." Whether here and in Jgs. 10:16 the expression *wattiqṣar napšî bāhem* represents an idiomatic expression denoting affect ("become vexed with") distinct from *qṣr npš* without a preposition may be left an open question.[25] Jgs. 10:16 describes Yahweh's reaction to Israel's repentance according to the Dtr schema: "He was distressed at the travail *(wattiqṣar napšô ba'ᵃmal)* of Israel."

Mic. 2:7 uses *qṣr rûaḥ* of Yahweh without any preposition; the passage presents numerous problems of speaker, text, and continuity. The question *hᵃqāṣar rûaḥ yhwh* is commonly put in the mouth of the prophet's enemies.[26]

Interpretation of the question asked by the people (or cited by Micah), "Is Yahweh impatient? Are these his doings?" does not depend on the problematic rendering of v. 7a, whether we retain the MT *h'mwr byt y'qb*[27] or emend the text to *h'rwr.* Appealing confidently to the confessional affirmation of Yahweh's patience (Ex. 34:6; Ps. 86:15; etc.), the people call into question the possibility of Yahweh's impatience or righteous anger. Haak interprets the question as Micah's reply to the representatives of the people quoted in v. 6 — "Is Yahweh powerless (to impose judgment)?" — but this proposal is unlikely.[28]

Prov. 10:27 contains the only use of *qṣr* qal in a temporal sense: "The fear of Yahweh prolongs life, but the years of the wicked will be short."

2. *Other Stems.* The other stems of the verb convey only the temporal dimension, in the sense of "shorten," e.g., the piel in Sir. 30:24a (ms. B), in a collection of maxims concerning health: *qn'h w'[p y]qṣrw ymym,* "Jealousy and anger shorten one's days." In Ps. 102:24(23) (a lament), it is Yahweh who has shortened the psalmist's days. In a lament over the fall of the monarchy, Ps. 89:46(45) uses the hiphil: "You have cut short the days of his youth."[29] The reflexive form *'l ttqṣr btplh* in Sir. 7:10 (ms. A), in a series of vetitives concerning proper conduct toward God, appears to have many layers of

---

21. Richter, 169, 201, 205.
22. Haak, 166-67.
23. *HAL.*
24. J. A. Soggin, *Juges. CAT* Vb (1987), 218.
25. Cf. Richter, 170, 187-90, 201, 204.
26. For a full discussion see B. Renaud, *La formation du livre de Michée* (Paris, 1977), 81-103; more recently H. W. Wolff, *Micah* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1990), 68, 70; E. A. Neiderhiser, *BTB* 11 (1981) 104-7; Richter, 185.
27. Renaud, *Formation,* 81-103; Neiderhiser, *BTB* 11 (1981) 104-7.
28. Haak, 165.
29. On the difference between the piel and the hiphil see *HP,* 35-36, 87ff.; Richter, 204, 205 n. 51.

meaning: "Do not be too brief in your prayer," or, with LXX and Vg., "Do not be pusillanimous/impatient in your prayer."[30]

3. *Noun and Adjective.* The noun appears only in Ex. 6:9 (P), in a construct phrase describing the reaction of the Israelites to the announcement of the exodus from Egypt: "They would not listen to Moses *miqqōṣer rûaḥ ûmēʿᵃḇōḏâ qāšâ.*" On the evidence of the parallel expression and the context (forced labor, vv. 6-7), this phrase refers more likely to tribulation, pusillanimity, and discouragement than to impatience.[31]

The meaning of the adj. *qāṣār/qāṣēr* depends on the subject of the construct phrase; the combinations are largely analogous to those of the verb.[32] The *qᵉṣar ʾappayim* of Prov. 14:17a probably displays unrestrained anger (cf. v. 29, *ʾrk ʾpym*), in contrast (v. 17b) to someone who is calm and restrained (following the positive interpretation of *mᵉzimmâ* by LXX: *phrónimos*).[33] The negative interpretation found in MT ("the schemer is hated"[34]) fails to make v. 17b an antithesis. Prov. 14:29, "Whoever is slow to anger has great understanding, but one who has a hasty temper exalts folly," contrasts the patient individual *(ʾrk ʾpym;* cf. Eccl. 7:8; Sir. 5:11: *ʾrk rwḥ)* with one who is short-winded, impatient, and unrestrained (*qṣr rwḥ;* cf. Prov. 14:17a), who here — as in 14:17a — engenders folly. In Job 14, a lament over the transitoriness of human life, v. 1 describes the mortal born of woman and full of trouble as *qᵉṣar yāmîm,* "short-lived" (cf. Ps. 89:46[45]; 102:24[23]). The parallel texts 2 K. 19:26 = Isa. 37:27, from Yahweh's response to Hezekiah's appeal for help against Sennacherib, present the Assyrian king as a mere instrument of Yahweh for the destruction of the city; its inhabitants are described as *qiṣrê yāḏ,* powerless (NRSV "shorn of strength"), who are dismayed and confounded. The analogous constructions with the verb in Isa. 50:2; 59:1; Nu. 11:23 were theological statements referring to Yahweh's power to save; these adjectival phrases are purely secular in content (cf. Arab. *qaṣīr al-yad,* "powerless, impotent").[35]

4. *Classification of Texts.* A necessarily hypothetical listing of the preexilic texts using the root might include Nu. 11:23; 21:4; Jgs. 16:16; Mic. 2:7; Isa. 28:20. There is no demonstrable difference between strictly secular and the theological use of the root or of particular constructions.

III. Dead Sea Scrolls. In the Dead Sea Scrolls the noun (which occurs in the OT only in Ex. 6:9), appears in 1QS 6:26, in a description of the punishment threatened for

30. See I. Lévi, *L'Ecclésiatique,* II (Paris, 1901), 40-41. For the former see M. H. Segal, *Spr bn syr'hšlm* (Jerusalem, ³1972), 45; cf. also G. Sauer, *JSHRZ,* III/5, 522; Richter, 204-5 with *HAL:* "be brief." For the latter see *GesB;* N. Peters, *Das Buch Jesus Sirach* (Münster, 1913), 65, 68.

31. Cf. also LXX and Haak, 163. *HAL:* not entirely certain.

32. On the vocalization see W. Baumgartner, *Beiträge zum hebräischen Lexikon. BZAW* 77 (²1961), 30-31.

33. W. McKane, *Proverbs. OTL* (1970), 232, 468; cf. also L. Alonso-Schökel and J. Vilchez Lindez, *Proverbios* (Madrid, 1984), 318-19.

34. O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos. BK* XVII (1983), 173; → IV, 89.

35. *HAL,* III, 1126.

anyone in the community who speaks *bqṣr 'pym,* "in a fit of temper." The words *qṣwr 'pym* in 1QS 4:10, characterizing the spirit of the wicked, are probably also a noun phrase. The adjective probably appears in 4Q186 fr. 2, 1:3-4: *whw'h lw' 'rwk wlw' qṣr.*

Prijs points out an interesting nuance of figurative usage in the Talmud: *d'tw qṣrh 'lyw* means "he is sensitive, he cannot tolerate something."[36]

Marböck

---

36. Prijs, 13-14; Bab. *B. Bat.* 145b; *Ber.* 29b; *Ḥul.* 107b.

קָרָא *qārā'*; מִקְרָא *miqrā'*

I. 1. *Etymology.* The root *qr'* occurs in all Semitic languages but Ethiopic;[1] it encompasses a range of meanings from "cry, call, summon, invite, pray, read, recite" to "sing" or (Middle Hebrew) "crow."[2] The basic meaning could be identified with loud

---

qārā'. H. J. Boecker, *Redeformen des Rechtslebens im AT. WMANT* 14 (²1970); J. Fichtner, "Die etymologische Ätiologie in den Namengebungen der geschichtlichen Bücher des ATs," *VT* 6 (1956) 372-96; K. Galling, "Die Ausrufung des Namens als Rechtsakt in Israel," *TLZ* 81 (1956) 65-70; J. Heller, "Namengebung und Namendeutung," *EvT* 27 (1967) 255-66; P. Katz, "מִקְרָא in der griechischen und lateinischen Bibel," *ZAW* 65 (1953) 253-55; R. Kessler, "Benennung des Kindes durch israelitische Mutter," *WuD* 19 (1987) 25-35; E. Kutsch, "מִקְרָא," *ZAW* 65 (1953) 247-53; C. J. Labuschagne, "קרא *qr'* rufen," *THAT,* II, 666-74; I. Lande, *Formelhafte Wendungen der Umgangssprache im AT* (Leiden, 1949); A. Tacke, "Zu Jes 29,18," *ZAW* 32 (1911) 311-13; P. Weimar, *Untersuchungen zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Pentateuch. BZAW* 146 (1977); A. S. van der Woude, "שֵׁם *šēm* Name," *THAT,* II, 935-63; E. Zenger, *Israel am Sinai* (²1985); *idem, Die Sinaitheophanie. FzB* 3 (1971).

→ אמר *'āmar.*

1. Labuschagne, 666; *LexSyr,* 689; *MdD,* 414.
2. *HAL,* III, 1128.

speech. In Akkadian the root is represented by *qerû(m)*, Assyr. *qarā'u(m)*, "invite" (human beings or gods), "summon" (e.g., to battle), "call away" (in death).[3]

The semantic range of Syr. *qᵉrā'* includes the entire spectrum given above;[4] Aramaic usage is similar.[5] Mandaic extends the range of meanings through "call into being" to "create." Ugar. *qr'* means "call, summon, invite."[6] In Phoenician and Punic we find the root with the meanings "pray, call upon," and "read."[7]

In the South Semitic languages *qr'* underwent a different course of development. In certain Old South Arabic texts the root appears still to mean "call upon"[8] or "call together."[9] In Classical Arabic, however, the meaning is restricted to "read, recite," but also "assemble."[10] It appears as an Arabic loanword in Tigr. *qär'a*, with the meaning "read, recite."[11]

Schauerte (Barteldrees)

2. *LXX.* In more than 500 instances, the LXX uses *kaleín* and its compounds for the qal, niphal, and pual of *qārā'*.[12] Elsewhere the situation is highly complex. Besides *kaleín*, we find *boán* and its compounds (48 times), *anaginṓskein* (38 times), *eponomázein* (32 times), *krázein* (29 times), and *kērýssein* (16 times). There are also isolated uses of *laleín* (7 times), *légein* (5 times), *anakrázein* (4 times), and other verbs.

3. *General Observations.* The verb *qārā'* occurs 738 times in the OT. The overwhelming majority (661) of occurrences are of the qal; there are some 60 occurrences of the niphal, and a few of the pual. No semantic differentiation is discernible. We also find several derivatives: *qôrê'*, "caller," a kind of partridge; "gatekeeper" (1 Ch. 9:19; 26:1); "Levite + gatekeeper" (2 Ch. 31:14); *miqrā'*, "summons, proclamation, recitation, place of assembly";[13] *qārî'*, "one who is called, representative of the assembly,"[14] but in Nu. 16:2 "chosen for the assembly"; *qᵉrî'â* (noun), "message" (only Jon. 3:2).

II. Communication at a Distance. Labuschagne gives the basic meaning of the verb as "attract someone's attention by the sound of one's voice."[15] This action serves to establish communication over some distance. The act of calling can preserve this

---

3. *AHw*, II, 918; *CAD*, Q, 242.
4. *LexSyr*, 689ff.
5. *LexLingAram*, 151; cf. *KAI*, 214.13; 233.12: "call."
6. *WUS*, no. 2448; *UT*, no. 2267; *CML*², 157.
7. "Pray, call": *KAI*, 10.2,7; 189.2-3; "read": *KAI*, 145.14; 165.1; 193.9-10,12; 196.5,13. For a discussion of the root in all the Northwest Semitic languages, see *DISO*, 263-64.
8. Biella, 465; context obscure.
9. ContiRossini, 232.
10. Wehr, 753; Lane, I/7, 2502-3.
11. *WbTigr*, 243; Leslau, *Contributions*, 48.
12. K. L. Schmidt, "καλέω," *TDNT*, III, 487-501.
13. On the translation "feast day" see Kutsch.
14. Labuschagne, 666, contra W. A. Irwin, *AJSL* 17 (1940) 95-97.
15. P. 668; cf. *HAL*, III, 1128.

distance or abolish it, leading to the primary semantic distinction "call out to"[16] versus "summon."[17] Under each category we may identify further semantic differentiations.

As a rule the subject-object relationship established and described by *qārā'* is personal and functions both in the interpersonal realms and in the relations between human beings and God. With respect to this difference, we may make the same observation as in the case of *'āmar:* the difference does not lie in the reservation of a particular term or formula for use in the theological realm, but solely in the subject-object relationship.[18]

Only rarely is the object an impersonal entity (drought, Hag. 1:11; famine, Ps. 105:16; grain, Ezk. 36:29); in Ps. 147:9 and Isa. 34:14 the subjects are animals. Unlike *'āmar, qārā'* does not always require a direct object or introduce direct or indirect discourse; it can also be used absolutely. When *qārā'* emphasizes the establishment of a relationship, the prep. *l^e, 'eṯ,* or *'el* is used. When *qārā'* bridges a distance, we find the prep. *'el* or *'aḥ^{a}rê.*

Since the connotations that flesh out the basic meaning depend more on the specific context than on a semantic development, we are justified in organizing our survey on the basis of contextually conditioned semantic fields, within which we shall then trace diachronic development.

1. *Communication with Other Persons.* a. *Attracting Attention.* The primary purpose of calling out (*qārā',* 2 K. 7:11; Jer. 31:6; *qārā'* [*b^e*]*qôl* [*gāḏôl*]) is to attract attention; there is accordingly no direct object. When used with (*b^e*)*qôl gāḏôl,* the verb stands absolutely (Gen. 39:14; 1 K. 18:27,28; cf. Ezk. 8:18; 9:1) or introduces speech (2 K. 18:28 par. Isa. 36:13; Ezk. 9:1; 2 Ch. 32:18); cf. also *qārā'* with *qôl* (Gen. 39:15,18; Jgs. 9:7; Isa. 6:4; Ps. 27:7; Prov. 8:1) and *qārā'* par. *mālē'* (Jer. 4:5; 12:6) with an object or *b^{e}gārôn* (Isa. 58:1). In 1 K. 18:27-28 the prophets of Baal cry aloud to attract Baal's attention; thus *qārā'* becomes a term for calling upon gods (cf. vv. 24,26) or even Yahweh (Ps. 27:7). In Isa. 58:1 shouting aloud *(qārā' b^{e}gārôn)* is part of the prophet's commission; in Jer. 4:5 *qārā'* stands absolutely and refers to a herald's shout.[19]

The attracting of attention is accentuated especially by *qārā' b^e'ōzen* (Jgs. 7:3; Jer. 2:2; Ezk. 8:18; 9:1); in this usage, however, we always find a direct object (troops, Jgs. 7:3; Jerusalem, Jer. 2:2; a person, Ezk. 8:18; 9:1). The establishment of a communicative link thus enters the picture. In Jer. 2:2 *qārā'* introduces a message delivered by a messenger. In Ezk. 9:1 Yahweh is the subject: *qārā'* introduces his command.

b. *Establishment of Communication.* As an expression denoting the establishment of communication ("call to"), *qārā'* always involves a direct subject-object relationship; *'āmar,* however, takes over the function of introducing the words spoken.[20] The prep. *'el* or *'aḥ^{a}rê* signals that, despite the establishment of communication, the distance be-

---

16. Discussed in this section.
17. See III below.
18. → I, 331.
19. See IV.2 below.
20. → I, 330, 333-34.

tween subject and object is maintained, whether literally in spatial separation between individuals or figuratively in the relationship between God and mortals.

A diachronic survey of the occurrences shows that the earliest texts describe establishment of the relationship between God and human beings, although purely secular usage is undoubtedly prior.

Within the Pentateuch there are five such texts, all of which belong to the Elohistic fragments (Gen. 21:17; 22:11,15; Ex. 3:4; 19:3). They have in common the establishment of a relationship between God and a human person and a statement of where God (or the mediating *mal'aḵ 'elōhîm*) is calling from. In Ex. 3:4 it is *'elōhîm* who initiates the relationship; in Ex. 19:3, Yahweh (perhaps originally *'elōhîm*[21]). In general, calling the name initiates the relationship. Usually the incident marks a particular high point in the history of God's involvement with humanity: Abraham's sacrifice, the revelation to Moses, the revelation at Sinai. This choice of an expression that emphasizes the enduring distance between God and humanity may be related to the Elohist's unique understanding of God.

All ten occurrences in the Dtr History fall in the secular domain of interpersonal relationships. In 1 S. 9:26 Samuel calls out to Saul while the latter is standing on the roof of a house; in 1 K. 17:11 Elijah calls out a request to the widow as she is leaving.

In Jgs. 18:23; 1 S. 17:8; 26:14; 2 S. 2:26, the action involves hostile armies or individuals, who call out from a distance they are concerned to preserve (see esp. 1 S. 26:13-14). This distance is expressed by *'aḥarê,* which (in contrast to *'el,* "[call] to") signals that the parties to the communication do not have their faces turned toward each other ("call after," 1 S. 20:37,38; 24:9[Eng. 8]). In 1 K. 13:21 *qārā' 'el* introduces a messenger formula.

While the examples in the Pentateuch and the Dtr History refer to concrete situations (and are therefore associated with particular persons, places, and times), the occurrences in the Prophets and Psalms focus on situations without any spatial or temporal anchor.

In Isa. 6:3 *qārā'* bridges the distance between the seraphim. In 21:11 *qārā'* also serves to introduce the words of the audition. The distance to be bridged between God and the prophet is identified by *'ēlay* and *miśśē'îr.* The language in the call of Deutero-Isaiah is analogous (40:3,[6]).

In Ezk. 36:29 the combination of *qārā'* and *rāḇâ* (hiphil) explicitly emphasizes the function of establishing communication. Yahweh establishes a relationship with something (grain) for the purpose of using it to demonstrate his efficacious power.

Ps. 42:8(7) shows a relationship between two personified material entities: deep calls to deep.

c. *Introducing Discourse.* When *qārā'* itself takes on the function of introducing the words spoken, the object is usually not expressed explicitly.[22] It introduces the actual words spoken by one person to another (Gen. 45:1; Jgs. 7:20; 2 S. 18:26; 20:16; 2 K.

21. Zenger, *Israel,* 131, 180.
22. → I, 334.

11:14; Jer. 4:20 [niphal]; Lam. 4:15), with Yahweh as subject (Ex. 34:6; 1 S. 3:6), with a human subject but spoken from the perspective of Yahweh (Ps. 89:27[26]; Jer. 3:4), or with a human subject (2 S. 22:4; Job 17:14; Ps. 18:4[3]; Jer. 20:8). In Lev. 13:45 the element of signalizing separation comes to the fore: the words "Unclean, unclean" that a leper is required to call out are intended to keep others at a distance.

According to Ex. 34:6, "Yahweh only passes before Moses when he appears and then speaks to him from some distant place shrouded in mystery."[23] Here the use of *qārā'* to introduce discourse underlines the enduring distance between God and human beings.

In 1 S. 3:6 we have an example of the transparency of the basic meaning to specific connotations. In the narrative context the simple fact that *qārā'* introduces the call "Samuel, Samuel," has a special function: it is the call of Yahweh, empowering Samuel to serve Yahweh. Here *qārā'* becomes a technical term for a call to the service of Yahweh.

In Jon. 3:4 the words Jonah calls out are a prophetic message; thus *qārā'* is also marked as a term for prophetic proclamation.

2. *Communication with Yahweh.* Throughout the OT, but especially in Psalms, *qārā'* finds explicit use as a term to denote the establishment of a relation between a human individual and God.[24] Of its 55 occurrences in the Psalter, 45 may be assigned to this semantic category, roughly half of all the occurrences with this meaning in the OT. The object is normally introduced by the prep. *'el;* when the verb is used absolutely (in Psalms and Isaiah), the context makes clear that it is Yahweh to whom the psalmist's call is addressed (Yahweh as subj. of *ʿānâ* or *šāmaʿ* in parallel or chiasm). In addition, the formula *qārā' bᵉšēm yhwh* shows that we are dealing here with an explicitly cultic invocation of Yahweh.

a. *qārā' bᵉšēm yhwh.* The formula *qārā' bᵉšēm yhwh* occurs five times in Genesis (4:26b; 12:8; 13:4; 21:33; 26:25; possibly J/JE); here it is the idiom of choice to express the establishment of a relationship with Yahweh. Invoking a name is not a magical technique that uses the name to summon up a person; it is the verbal appeal for the deity's presence that is foundational to all acts of prayer and worship. This understanding of the cult differs markedly from that of Israel's neighbors, who viewed the cult as a drama or an expressive ceremony.[25]

In the context of the Primeval History, the statement in Gen. 4:26b that people began to worship Yahweh is intended to mark not the inauguration of a particular cult, but the beginning of cultic worship in general. All the other occurrences in Genesis appear in the setting of itinerary notices in J's patriarchal narrative; they clearly refer to early forms of the nomadic cult, without cultic mediators (priests). This language also emphasizes that the texts refer to cultic observances, not the establishment of a cult. Ex-

23. M. Noth, *Exodus. ATD* V (⁶1988), 215.
24. → I, 331.
25. C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1984), 340-41.

cept in 21:33, which speaks of planting a tamarisk, the expression *qārā' b^e^šēm yhwh* is always associated with a statement about building an altar. According to Westermann, this association of invocation with altar building represents the fact that worship in its simplest form involves the fundamental elements of word and action.[26] With the exception of Ex. 34:5 (Zenger believes that Moses is the subject of the verb and assigns the verse to JE[27]), the phrase *qārā' b^e^šēm yhwh* in the sense of "establish cultic contact" does not occur again in the Pentateuch.

The only instance of *qārā' b^e^šēm yhwh* in the Dtr History is in 1 K. 18:24, at the midpoint of a pre-Dtr narrative revised and interpolated by DtrP.[28] Its purpose is to demonstrate that Yahweh is the only deity endowed with power. This purpose is underlined by the fact that only in the context of this narrative (with the exception of Hos. 11:7) do we find *qārā' b^e^šēm* used with reference to other gods (Baal: vv. 24,25,26). But no contact is made: the expression *qārā' b^e^šēm* succeeds only with Yahweh as its object. The same expression with Baal as its object has no independent purpose; it is used only to promote the cult of Yahweh by demonstrating that the cult of Baal is futile.

In the Psalter *qārā' b^e^šēm yhwh* refers in laments to a cry of lamentation addressed to Yahweh (Ps 79:6; 80:19[18]; 116:4); in thanksgivings and hymns such a cry is an expression of praise and exultation (105:1; 116:13,17). Here the expression *qārā' b^e^šēm yhwh* can be translated "call out the name of Yahweh" in the sense of "proclaim publically."[29] The act is no longer directed toward Yahweh but to an unspecified audience (cf. also Dt. 32:3; Isa. 12:4). The occurrences of *qārā' b^e^šēm yhwh* in the prophetic books (Isa. 64:6[7]; 65:1 [pual]; Jer. 10:25; Joel 3:5[2:32]; Zeph. 3:9; Zec. 13:9) may be interpreted along similar lines; most of them date from the late postexilic period.

In Ex. 33:19 Yahweh himself is the subject of *qārā' b^e^šēm yhwh;* the LXX therefore shifts the expression to the first person.[30] The correct translation is disputed;[31] the verse probably prepares for 34:6, and therefore the rendering "call out with the name 'Yahweh'" appears the most plausible. In this context, then, *qārā'* becomes a technical term for revelatory occurrence.[32]

b. *qārā' 'el-yhwh.* The earliest occurrences of *qārā' 'el-yhwh* are in Dt. 15:9 and 24:15; both passages may be assigned to a Dtn redaction.[33] The expression appears in the context of legal ordinances; its purpose is to invoke Yahweh as guarantor of right order against those who do wrong. In 1 S. 12:18 the calling upon Yahweh coupled with a prayer for rain is a way of summoning Yahweh to bear witness that the people's de-

26. For a different view see E. Blum, *Die Komposition des Vätergeschichte. WMANT* 57 (1984), 334-38.

27. *Israel,* 135-36, 142; *Sinaitheophanie,* 95-96.

28. E. Würthwein, *Könige II. ATD* XI/2 (1984), *in loc.*

29. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1989), *in loc.*

30. See *BHS.*

31. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11,* 340-410.

32. See also van der Woude, 950.

33. H. D. Preuss, *Deuteronomium. EdF* 164 (1982), 53, 57.

mand for a king is wicked.[34] In all other instances (esp. in the Psalms), *qārā' 'el-yhwh* means invoking Yahweh in prayer or in the cult. Used in parallel with *'āmar,* the expression introduces the actual words of the petition addressed to Yahweh: for deliverance from thirst (Jgs. 15:18), for physical strength (Jgs. 16:28), for healing of a deadly disease (1 K. 17:20-21). In most cases, by describing the results of calling upon Yahweh the petitioner bears witness to Yahweh's effectual power (1 S. 12:17-18; 2 K. 20:11).

Dt. 4:7 associates making contact with Yahweh by means of *qārā'* with the notion of Yahweh's nearness independent of any cultic site; this notion is unique within the book of Deuteronomy.[35] On the one hand, it lies behind Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the temple, an observation that can be traced to the influence of Dt. 4:7 on the verses framing this prayer (1 K. 8:29,52-53).[36] On the other hand, it appears also in association with *qārā' 'el-yhwh* in Ps. 145:18 (late), Deutero-Isaiah (Isa. 55:6), and Lam. 3:57.[37]

Invocation of Yahweh is characteristic of psalms of lament, but *qārā'* is not used exclusively as a term for invocation; neither does it always stand in introductory position. Although the expression *qārā' 'ēlêḵā (yhwh)* appears primarily in psalms of lament, it is not restricted to this genre: it appears also in hymns, thanksgivings, and psalms of trust. In the latter setting, however, we note a difference in function: in the psalms of lament, *qārā'* denotes a speech act taking place in the present (performative), contextually defined as "cry, beseech, lament, weep," a meaning that informs the entire psalm (Ps. 22:3[2]; 27:7; 28:1; 61:3[2]; 141:1); in thanksgivings, however, *qārā'* always refers to an event in the past (18:7[6]; 34:7[6]; 66:17; 118:5; 138:3), while the performative function is taken over by other verbs (praise, thank, extol). The technically constant function of *qārā'* is underlined by parallel *'ānâ,* denoting the response to *qārā'* (4:2,4[1,3]; 17:6; 20:10[9]; 22:3[2]; 27:7; 91:15 [from the perspective of Yahweh]; 102:3[2]; 118:5; 120:1; 130:1; 141:1). We must also understand *'ānâ* in a technical sense, rather than simply as "respond" (not necessarily verbally[38]). Its meaning depends on the context of the psalm (granting of a petition, deliverance, forgiveness, healing). This, then, is the theological import of *qārā'* in conjunction with *'ānâ:* prior to any specific instantiation, it expresses quite fundamentally "the profoundly dialogical nature of the relationship between God and human beings in the OT."[39]

On rare occasions *šāma'* serves to express the response (Ps. 27:7; 34:7[6]; Jer. 11:14; 29:12; Zec. 7:13).

The use of *qārā'* to denote the invocation of Yahweh is so intensive that it can convey this meaning even when used absolutely (Ps. 4:2[1]; 20:10[9]; 22:3[2]; 27:7; 119:145; 138:3).

---

34. F. Stolz, *ZBK* 9, 80-81.
35. D. Knapp, *Deuteronomium 4. GTA* 35 (1987), 66.
36. E. Würthwein, *Könige I. ATD* XI/1 (1985), 95.
37. J. Kühlewein, *THAT,* II, 680-81.
38. Labuschagne, 337-38.
39. → XI, 224.

The interplay of *qārā'* and *'ānâ* is not restricted to the Psalter (cf. Job 5:1; Isa. 58:9; Jer. 33:3). Yahweh can also be the subject of *qārā'*, with *'ānâ* being used to describe the expected human response (Isa. 50:2; 65:12; 66:4). The *qārā'-'ānâ* relationship can also be viewed from the perspective of Yahweh (Isa. 65:24; or Ps. 50:15; 91:15).

The Jonah novella focuses on the relationship between Yahweh and human beings in a situation of a totally resigned faith,[40] so that the verses using the expression *qārā' 'el-yhwh/'elōhîm* take on a special importance. They control the flow of the narrative and constitute the vehicle of the theme. Here *qārā' 'el-yhwh* clearly refers to the official public confession of Yahweh that was required of both Hebrews (Jon. 1:6; 2:3[2]) and Gentiles (1:14; 3:8) in the early Hellenistic period. This usage is distinct from the terms for dialogue with Yahweh *(pālal, 'ānâ).*

3. *Animal Communication.* In Ps. 147:9; Isa. 34:14; and possibly also Isa. 21:8, *qārā'* refers to the cry of an animal; in these passages, too, a kind of relationship is established. Some have suggested that in Isa. 34:14 we should read the niphal of *qārā'* II, "meet."[41]

Hossfeld/Kindl

III. Communication Abolishing Distance. The elimination of distance is always implied when *qārā'* is followed by a direct object, introduced by *l^e*, *'el,* or (rarely) *'eṯ.* In most cases *qārā'* denotes secular communication between human beings: summoning a person to communicate something. As the subject who does the summoning we find the Egyptian pharaoh (Gen. 12:18; 41:8,14; 46:33; Ex. 1:18; 7:11; 8:21[25]; 9:27; 10:16,24; 12:31), Abimelech (Gen. 20:8-9; 26:9), Isaac (Gen. 27:1; 28:1), Jacob (Gen. 47:29; 49:1), Moses (Ex. 12:21; 19:7; 34:31; Lev. 10:4; Nu. 16:12; Dt. 5:1; 29:1[2]; 31:7), Joshua (Josh. 4:4; 6:6; 9:22; 10:24; 22:1; 23:2), David (2 S. 1:15; 9:9; 14:33; 21:2; 1 Ch. 15:11; 22:6), Solomon (1 K. 2:36,42), Ahab (1 K. 18:3), the prophet Elisha (2 K. 9:1), King Joash (2 K. 12:8[7]), the prophet Jeremiah (Jer. 36:4), and Esther (Est. 4:5). These are all mentioned by name, but the subject may also be a group of unnamed persons, such as the men of Sodom (Gen. 19:5). The objects are equally various: the man (Gen. 3:9), Abraham (12:18; 20:9), Lot (19:5), Rebekah (24:58), Isaac (26:9), Esau (27:1), Jacob (27:42; 28:1), Rachel and Leah (31:4), Joseph (47:29), Moses (Ex. 8:4,21[8,25]; 9:27; 10:16,24; 12:31), Israel (Dt. 5:1; 29:1[2]; 33:19), or collectives like men or priests (Josh. 4:4; 6:6; 9:22). Yahweh can also be the subject of calling in the sense of summoning, but Yahweh is never mentioned as object.

1. *With Human Subjects.* The qal of *qārā'* (3 times the niphal: Est. 3:12; 4:11; 8:9) means "call someone to come, summon" (e.g., 2 S. 14:33; 1 K. 12:3; 2 K. 4:36). Here the text explicitly says that the person called responds by coming. Usually, however,

40. H. W. Wolff, *Obadiah and Jonah* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1977), 88.
41. See *BHS* and *HAL,* III, 1132.

the arrival of the person summoned is implicit, since the text proceeds to describe directly the purpose for which that individual has been called, as in Jer. 36:4: "Then Jeremiah called *(wayyiqrā')* Baruch son of Neriah, and Baruch wrote down all the words of Jeremiah" (cf. also Ex. 7:11; Jgs. 16:25; 1 S. 16:8; 2 S. 1:7; 1 K. 12:20; 2 K. 4:15; Est. 4:5).

Used in conjunction with *'āmar, qārā'* serves to introduce direct discourse, establishing the contact necessary for the dialogue introduced by *'āmar,* as in Gen. 12:18: "Pharaoh called *(qārā')* Abram and said *('āmar)*"; there follow the actual words spoken by Pharaoh. Here too *qārā'* implies that a distance is overcome. The text does not say how great this distance is from which a person is summoned; it is clear only that the person summoned is not immediately present.

Some translate Ex. 12:31 as: "Then Pharaoh had Moses and Aaron summoned (*qārā'* qal!)"; obviously a messenger was involved, and therefore we would expect a hiphil, which the text does not use.

The substance of what follows the summoning varies widely. It can be a "simple" directive to perform some action: "Come forward and do thus and so" (Lev. 10:4; Jgs. 16:18; 2 S. 1:15; cf. 2 S. 13:17; 1 K. 17:10), communication of information (Gen. 27:42; 31:4; 49:1; Josh. 24:1; 2 K. 7:10), or a charge or command (Ex. 12:21; Lev. 9:1; Josh. 4:4; Jgs. 9:54; cf. 1 Ch. 15:11; 22:6). Occasionally a self-indictment is inserted into one of these charges, as when Pharaoh summons Moses and Aaron, repents of his ill conduct, and orders them to depart from Egypt (Ex. 9:27; 10:16; 12:31). Sometimes, too, others are accused of misconduct (Gen. 12:18; 39:14; 1 S. 22:11; 1 K. 2:42; 2 K. 12:8[7]; 2 Ch. 24:6).

Three texts in the Dtr corpus (Dt. 5:1; 29:1[2]; 31:7) use *qārā'* with Moses as subject in connection with the proclamation of laws; here *qārā'* refers "only" to the summoning of the people; *'āmar* is the term for the actual proclamation. Apart from these three Dtr texts, the remainder are distributed generally among the various source strata of the Pentateuch (e.g., J, Gen. 12:18; J/E, Gen. 27:42; P, Ex. 9:27; 10:16; Lev. 9:1).

The discourse introduced by *qārā'* and *'āmar* can also begin a dialogue, usually continued by means of *'āmar* (rarely *'ānâ:* Gen. 41:14-15; Josh. 9:22). The reason for the response of the person addressed is usually that the summoner has asked a question that demands information (Gen. 19:5; 24:58; 27:1; Josh. 9:22; 1 S. 6:2; 2 K. 6:11) or contains an accusation that requires justification (Gen. 20:9; 26:9; Ex. 1:18). We also find requests to carry out some action (Gen. 41:14-15; 47:29; Ex. 8:21[25]; 10:24; 2 K. 4:22), commands (1 K. 2:36), and simple observations (1 S. 29:6; 2 S. 9:9; 1 K. 20:7) embodying an assent or leading to another question.

Less frequently the communication inaugurated by *qārā'* is followed by indirect discourse. In these cases too *qārā'* serves to summon individuals or groups to whom something is communicated. The indirect discourse can be introduced by *'āmar* (2 S. 21:2; 1 K. 22:9; 2 K. 4:36; 2 Ch. 18:8), *dibber* (Gen. 20:8), *sāpar* (Gen. 41:8), *śîm* (Ex. 19:7), *higgîḏ* (1 S. 19:7), or *hišbîa'* (Neh. 5:12). The response of the person summoned is occasionally reported (1 K. 22:9; 2 K. 4:36; 2 Ch. 18:8).

The verb *qārā'* itself can be an element of direct discourse when one person says to another, "Call so and so" (Jgs. 16:25; 2 S. 17:5; 1 K. 1:28,32; 2 K. 4:12,15; 10:19).

2. *With Yahweh as Subject.* Yahweh may also call to establish communication. Those called include Adam (Gen. 3:9), Moses (Ex. 19:20; 24:16; Lev. 1:1), Aaron and Miriam (Nu. 12:5), and a man clothed in linen (Ezk. 9:3). Those whom Yahweh calls respond by coming to him. When Yahweh speaks *(qārā')* to them, Adam (Gen. 3:9) and Moses (Ex. 19:20) answer *('āmar).* The words of Yahweh introduced by *qārā'* have the nature of commands: in Ex. 19:20-21 (J) Yahweh tells Moses to warn the people not to approach; Lev. 1:1 (P) introduces sacrificial regulations that Moses is to transmit to the people; in Gen. 3:9 (J), behind Yahweh's question "Where are you?" lies a command to Adam to come forth and account for his actions. In 2 K. 3:10,13, Yahweh summons the kings of Israel, Judah, and Edom to give them into the hands of the Moabites. In Isa. 13:3 Yahweh summons his warriors to execute judgment against Babylon (cf. Jer. 1:15).

Prophetic and late Dtr texts often use *qārā'* for an indirect call or summons, which — because it is not direct — does not establish communication. Yahweh laments that his people did not listen when he called (Jer. 7:13) and that they will not listen in the future (v. 26; cf. 35:17; also Job 19:16; Lam. 1:19). In Am. 5:8 and 9:6, Yahweh calls the waters of the sea *(mê hayyām);* both passages may be secondary.[42] Here we see clearly a connotation that goes beyond the basic meaning: *qārā'* appears as an act of power reserved to Yahweh alone, transcending human ability. Note also Ezk. 36:29: Yahweh summons the grain *(dāgān);* Isa. 40:26: Yahweh calls by name *(qārā' b^e^šēm)* the stars that he created *(bārā');* Am. 7:4: Yahweh calls a shower of fire *('ēš).*

3. *Special Cases.* a. *Court.* In the juridical realm a summons can be a subpoena to appear before the court; it can therefore mark the beginning of judicial proceedings. The action can be purely secular (Dt. 25:8; Isa. 59:4) or it can involve God (Job 9:16; 13:22; 14:15). A summons or charge and the subsequent pleading or justification are expressed by the parallel use of *qārā'* and *'ānâ.*[43]

b. *Cult.* A summons in the cultic domain is found, for example, in Jer. 36:9: all who have come to Jerusalem are summoned to a fast before Yahweh *(ṣôm lip̱nê yhwh).* This fasting took place on the occasion of a penitential ceremony in the temple, in the course of which Baruch recited *(qārā')*[44] the words of Yahweh from the scroll of Jeremiah. Both served to urge the people to repent. The call to sacrifice in Am. 4:5 is more likely meant ironically: Amos rejects a purely outward cult, which serves the gratification and glory of the worshiper rather than the glorification of Yahweh.

c. *Military Service.* In military contexts *qārā'* means "call up, conscript for military service" (Jgs. 8:1; 12:1). In prophetic oracles (Jer. 4:5; Ezk. 38:21) Yahweh musters the troops for battle; these calls to military service are often linked with prophecies of disaster (without the use of *qārā'* see also, e.g., Jer. 46:3-6,9-10,14-15). In Ezk. 23:23 those who are conscripted (reading *q^e^rû'îm* with MT[45]) enjoy special honor.

42. H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1977), *in loc.*

43. Boecker, 58 n. 1; G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (^{2}1989), 195, 199, 207-8; → VI, 242.

44. See VI.4 below.

45. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), *in loc.*

d. *Invitations.* The verb *qārā'* can also mean "invite" (to share a meal). The object is generally introduced by *l^e^*. Virtually anyone can issue such an invitation: Reuel's daughters (Ex. 2:20), Samuel (1 S. 9:24), David (2 S. 11:13), Absalom (2 S. 13:23), Adonijah (1 K. 1:9-10,19,25-26), Job's sons (Job 1:4), Queen Esther (Est. 5:12). Those invited are also highly variable: Moses (Ex. 2:20), the people (1 S. 9:24), Urijah (2 S. 11:13), the king's sons (2 S. 13:23), etc. We read in 1 K. 1:9ff. that Adonijah explicitly refused to invite certain people. Through this usage the pass. ptcp. *qārû'/qᵉru'îm* became a technical term for "invited guest" (1 S. 9:13,22; 2 S. 15:11; 1 K. 1:41,49). The invitation can be to a sacrificial meal (Gen. 31:54; 1 S. 16:3,5), or in this specific case to a sacrificial meal for other gods (Ex. 34:15; Nu. 25:2). In the book of Proverbs, it is usually wisdom *(ḥoḵmâ)* who invites all (Prov. 8:4), especially the simple, to hear and receive the precious gifts that wisdom has to offer.[46] From the context 9:3 appears to be an invitation to a meal, but soon reveals itself as another invitation to follow the way of insight *(dereḵ bînâ,* v. 6). Similarly, 9:15 warns against accepting the invitation of Dame Folly *('ēšeṯ kᵉsîlûṯ,* v. 13), since the guests she invites *(qᵉru'eyhā)* are in the depths of Sheol (v. 18).

Hossfeld/Lamberty-Zielinski

IV. Proclamation.

1. *Public.* A number of specialized meanings have evolved from the basic meaning. In the context of a public forum, given the basic meaning "attract attention through the sound of one's voice," *qārā'* can take on the meaning "call out, proclaim." Many things can be proclaimed: festivals or feast days (Ex. 32:5; Lev. 23:2,4,21,37; Isa. 1:13; Lam. 1:15; 2:22), special days (Lam. 1:21), a general fast (1 K. 21:9,12; Joel 1:14; 2:15; Jon. 3:5; 2 Ch. 20:3; Ezr. 8:21), liberty or liberation *(dᵉrôr,* Lev. 25:10; Isa. 61:1-2; Jer. 34:8,15,17), a famine (2 K. 8:1), Yahweh's remission (Dt. 15:2), a king (Isa. 34:12), a holy war (Joel 4:9[3:9]).

The festival calendar of H (Lev. 23) uses *qārā'* four times in connection with the proclamation of feast days: twice (vv. 2,4) in introductory formulas and twice (vv. 21,37) in concluding formulas for the calendar.[47] The counterpart to this calendar in Dt. 16 says nothing about proclaiming a fast.

The formulations in Ex. 32:5; Isa. 1:13; Lam. 1:15; 2:22 clearly depend on Lev. 23. Ex. 32:5 (probably R^P^[48]) uses this dependence to establish the iniquity of Aaron's action. The dependence of Isa. 1:13 on Lev. 23 is clearly intended as a criticism of the cult: the point is to show that observance of the cultic festivals with an attitude that is fundamentally hypocritical is meaningless.[49] In both texts in Lamentations it is

---

46. O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos. BK* XVII (1983), 88.

47. For a detailed analysis of the literary strata see R. Kilian, *Literarkritische und formgeschichtliche Untersuchung des Heiligkeitsgesetzes. BBB* 19 (1963), 109-11; A. Cholewiński, *Heiligkeitsgesetz und Deuteronomium. AnBibl* 66 (1976), 82-94.

48. C. Dohmen, *Das Bilderverbot. BBB* 62 (²1987), 91.

49. O. Kaiser, *Jesaja 1–12. ATD* XVII (1981), 44-45; H. Wildberger, *Jesaja 1–12. BK* X/1 (1980), 42-43; R. Kilian, *Jesaja 1–12. NEB* XVII (1986), 23-24.

Yahweh himself who proclaims a festival day; here the usage is metaphorical, serving as a pejorative thematization of the fall of Jerusalem. It is this sense in which we must also interpret the day of Yahweh that is proclaimed (Lam. 2:22).

Proclamation of a fast appears to have been a common penitential practice.[50] Such fasting cannot be an act of private devotion. Proclamation by means of *qārā'* gives it a public character.[51] Such fast days were proclaimed on occasions of general (Joel 1:14; 2:15) or particular (Ezr. 8:21; Jon. 3:5) distress. The representatives of the people assembled on such an occasion could also function as a juridical body (1 K. 21:9,12).

In the expression "proclaim release [NRSV 'liberty'],"[52] the public proclamation denoted by *qārā'* includes the dimension of legal obligation. North shows that the earliest occurrences of this idiom are in Jer. 34 (vv. 8,15,17 [twice]), under the direct influence of Babylonian legislative practice.[53]

Originally, *qārā'* was probably used for proclamations in the domain of secular law (cf. Jer. 34:8). The binding authority of such a proclamation extends to the proclamation of a year of Yahweh's favor to those who mourn (Isa. 61:1-2). The interplay between Jer. 34:15 and 34:17 is a clever play on words: Yahweh's proclamation of release (v. 17: to sword, pestilence, and famine) is an ironic response to the retraction of the release of male and female Hebrew slaves (v. 16). The allusions to Ex. 21:2ff. and Dt. 15:1ff. found by North[54] are more formal in nature.[55] The noun *d^erôr* that functions as the object of the proclamation has here an extended semantic range similar to that of *š^emiṭṭâ* in Dt. 15:2; it applies not only to persons but to the universal restoration of original economic circumstances. When *qārā'* is used in the sense of "proclaim," it is impossible to draw a sharp line between the secular and religious domains.

Certain texts suggest that the act of proclamation was constitutive for aspects of political life: proclamation of a king (Isa. 34:12) or of a holy war (Joel 4:9[3:9]).

Dt. 31:11 furnishes an example of blurred semantic distinctions in the formula of Moses' charge to the elders of Israel: *tiqrā' 'eṯ-hattôrâ;* here *qārā'* conveys both the element of public proclamation and that of public recitation. In Dt. 20:10 and Jgs. 21:13 *šālôm* is the grammatical object of *qārā'*. The NRSV translates the idiom as "offer a town amicable terms."[56] We should possibly think of a proclamation in such a situation. Otto, however, argues on the basis of v. 11 that v. 10 refers to a formula of vindication, also attested in cuneiform legal codes.[57] The text of 1 S. 18:28 is disputed.

2. *Prophetic.* We also find *qārā'* used as a term for the proclamations of Yahweh through human beings, i.e., the message of the prophets (only in 1 and 2 Kings,

50. → צום *ṣûm.*
51. → XII, 299.
52. → דרור *d^erôr.*
53. → III, 267-68.
54. → *š^emiṭṭâ.*
55. The declaration in Lev. 25:10 is discussed in → III, 267-69.
56. Cf. *HAL,* III, 1130.
57. E. Otto, *ZAW* 102 (1990) 94-96.

Nehemiah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Jonah, and Zechariah). This meaning is often conveyed by the expression *qārāʾ ʾeṯ-haddāḇār* or *hadd*ᵉ*ḇārîm* (1 K. 13:4,32; 2 K. 23:16,17; Jer. 3:12; 7:2; 11:6; 19:2). The prep. *ʾel* or *ʿal* introduces the recipient of the prophetic message (Jerusalem, Isa. 40:2; Nineveh, Jon. 1:2). An exception is 1 K. 13:2,4,32, where an altar is addressed. The prophetic message itself is generally introduced by *ʾāmar* (1 K. 13:2; Neh. 6:7; Jer. 3:12; 7:2; 11:6; Jon. 3:4; Zec. 1:4,14,17).

The term cannot be assigned to a particular period or associated with a particular prophetic tradition. It is noteworthy that the combination *qārāʾ* + *dāḇār* always appears in Dtr texts.[58] This suggests that prophetic oracles may have been proclaimed like laws. All other occurrences of *qārāʾ* in the prophetic books (all postexilic) are in the imperative or the second person singular imperfective with imperative force, describing the commissioning of the prophet by Yahweh. This commissioning takes place in the context of first-person discourse with Yahweh as subject (Isa. 40:2; 58:1; Jer. 2:2; 3:12; 7:2; 11:6; 19:2); alternatively, some other term may substitute for Yahweh in the commissioning: *qôl* (Isa. 40:6), *way*ᵉ*hî d*ᵉ*ḇar-yhwh* (Jon. 1:1; 3:1), *malʾāḵ* (Zec. 1:14,17). Only Jon. 3:4 and the texts in 1 K. 13 and 2 K. 23 use *qārāʾ* to describe the act of prophetic proclamation. In 1 K. 13:2 the phrase *biḏbar yhwh* characterizes the *ʾîš* ᵉ*lōhîm* (v. 1) as being entrusted with Yahweh's word; *qārāʾ* then describes the act of proclamation.

In Neh. 6:7 *n*ᵉ*ḇîʾîm* are commissioned to proclaim the king. This proclamation permits certain conclusions concerning the designation of the king, which was among the official functions of the prophets, especially in the northern kingdom. This function of the prophets made clear that ultimately Yahweh stood behind the selection of the king.[59]

Hossfeld/Kindl

V. Calling.

1\. *1 S. 3.* The story of Samuel's call (1 S. 3) illustrates the transition from *qārāʾ* in the sense of "call, summon," to that of designating a prophetic "call" or "vocation." Samuel is called three times by Yahweh; he goes to Eli, who he thinks is summoning him, and says, "Here I am, for you called [= summoned] me." Not until the third time does Eli realize that it is Yahweh who has "called" Samuel; he instructs Samuel how to respond to this call. Thus Samuel receives his call through an audition in which he hears his name called (v. 20 refers explicitly to Samuel as *nāḇîʾ*, "one who has been called"[60]); here *qārāʾ* denotes the appointment of a prophet. Nowhere else, however, does *qārāʾ* have this usage. This observation may argue for an early dating of this call narrative, whose language has not yet been schematized in word-event formulas, etc.

2\. *Human Calling.* The verb *qārāʾ* can also refer to a kind of "call" outside the prophetic realms; in such contexts it means that the person called is singled out from a

58\. On 1 and 2 Kings see E. Würthwein, *Könige. ATD* XI (1985), *in loc.;* on Jeremiah see W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1–25. WMANT* 41 (1973), 85, 107-8, 148-49, 222.

59\. S. Herrmann, *A History of Israel in OT Times* (Eng. trans. Philadelphia, ²1981), 136.

60\. → IX, 139.

group. This usage is concentrated in the Priestly sections of the Pentateuch. In Nu. 1:15; 16:2; 26:9 (cj.), the *qᵉrûʾîm* are those called or chosen to represent the community or the tribes. This group includes the tribal representatives listed individually in Nu. 1:1-15, as well as Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, and 250 Israelite leaders (Nu. 16:1-2; 26:9). In Nu. 1:16 and 16:2, parallelism ranks them equal to the → נָשִׂיא *nāśîʾ* and the *rāʾšê ʾalpê yiśrāʾēl;* functionally, however, they are kept separate. In the story of Dathan and Abiram, they represent the people over against Moses (and Aaron), by bringing the demands of the people to Moses (and Aaron) during the wilderness period (only there are the *qᵉrûʾîm* attested in this sense). According to 16:9, these individuals were "chosen from the congregation of Israel," i.e., appointed to cultic service.[61]

A special vocation or distinction based on expert craftsmanship appears in Ex. 31:2; 35:30; 36:2 (*qārāʾ bᵉšēm* except in 35:30), which describe the commissioning of Bezalel in connection with the construction of the tent of meeting (Ex. 28ff.). This account represents an official appointment as director of craftwork, an appointment announced by Yahweh (31:1-2; 35:30) and realized through Moses as Yahweh's mediator (36:2). The context shows that Bezalel and his artisans were endowed by Yahweh with the requisite wisdom *(ḥoḵmâ bᵉlēḇ).*

3. *Deutero-Isaiah.* In some instances Deutero-Isaiah uses *qārāʾ* in the sense of "choose someone for a specific purpose." The subject is always Yahweh. For example, Cyrus is called by Yahweh to deliver Israel from the Babylonian exile (Isa. 41:25; 42:6; 45:3,4; 48:12,15). Such a call is occasionally expressed by the construction *qārāʾ bᵉšēm* (Isa. 41:25; 45:3,4), the meaning of which is not entirely clear in this context.[62] In Isa. 41:25 it probably alludes to a command relationship in the military domain (cf. Isa. 40:26; Est. 2:14). This language established a personal relationship between Yahweh and Cyrus his servant, which gives the latter special status. Behind this relationship stands "the relationship of the lord to his vassal, on whom he bestows security and assistance, but to whom he also a liege lord issues commands and on whom he imposes duties."[63] The usage of calling *(qārāʾ bᵉšēm)* as taking someone into one's service is also found in Babylonian royal inscriptions, where, for example, it characterizes Marduk's appointment of Cyrus. The purpose of Yahweh's "calling Cyrus by name" is an act with historically significant dimensions: Yahweh has called Cyrus to deliver Israel from exile. Therefore he bestows on Cyrus an honorific surname (*ʾaḵannᵉḵā,*[64] Isa. 45:4; cf. also the use of *knh* in parallel with *qārāʾ* in 44:5). Isa. 48:12-15 once again uses *qārāʾ* (this time without *bᵉšēm*) to thematize the call of Cyrus, interpreting this call as though it were an element of Yahweh's act of creation (v. 12).

In Isa. 42:6 (in the context of vv. 5-9), it is also Cyrus who is called. The text does not name him explicitly, but this interpretation is supported by Elliger and Merendino against

---

61. → בדל *bdl.*
62. K. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja. BK* XI/1 (1989), *in loc.*
63. *Ibid.*, 494-95.
64. → כנה *knh.*

Westermann.[65] Yahweh has called Cyrus *b^eṣeḏeq* (cf. 45:13). V. 6b states the purpose of the call: he has been formed *(yāṣar)* and given *(nāṯan)* as a covenant to the people *(liḇrîṯ 'ām)* and a light for the nations *(l^e'ôr gôyim)*. The significance of Cyrus's call is amplified by the circumstance that Israel too is called (*qārā'*, 48:12; 41:9; *qārā' b^ešēm*, 43:1). This language expresses the special relationship between Yahweh and his chosen people. The call of Israel stands in parallel with its creation (43:1), which demonstrates Yahweh's omnipotence and consequently empowers him to deliver his people. The nature of Israel's call echoes the call of Abraham, also formulated with *qārā'*: according to 51:2, Abraham and Sarah were exemplary in their trust in Yahweh, even when they were alone. Just so should Israel trust in the omnipotence of Yahweh, even in exile. Not even the exile can annul the continuity of creation — call of Abraham — call of Israel.

In the second servant song (Isa. 49:1-9), *qārā'* denotes the appointment of the speaker as Yahweh's servant. The formula *yhwh mibbeṭen q^erā'ānî mimm^e'ê 'immî hizkîr š^emî* resembles the language of Jeremiah's call in Jer. 1:5 (Dtr), although the latter uses *nāṯan* instead of *qārā'*. The call of the servant is thus comparable to that of a prophet. The divine appointment of an individual before birth is mentioned only in the case of Deutero-Isaiah (cf. also Isa. 44:2,24; 49:5; 48:8), Jeremiah, and Samson (Jgs. 13:7); this feature originates in Egypt and Mesopotamia, where birth and descent determine who shall be king.[66] In the four servant songs Isa. 49:1 is the only text that speaks explicitly of a call from the mother's womb. The core of the second song (49:1-3 [without *yiśrā'ēl*], 4,5a,6 [without *wayyōmer*][67]) clearly details the nature of the servant's call: his is a ministry of the word (v. 2), he has been chosen as a servant (v. 3), the servant's affliction is overcome by God (v. 4), the servant has been singled out for the deliverance of Israel (vv. 5-6; cf. the call [*qārā'*] of God's *'eḇeḏ 'elyāqîm* in 22:20).

VI. Reading.

1. *General.* Starting with the basic meaning "call" and proceeding through "proclaim," *qārā'* developed the meaning "read, recite." It is reasonably safe to assume that most instances involve reading aloud or public recitation.[68] This semantic development must be considered secondary, since *qārā'* in the sense of "read" is first attested in the exilic period (esp. in Dtr texts).

The material read appears as the direct object of *qārā'* (as a suffix or introduced by *'eṯ*). One may read quietly, so that only the reader hears the words (2 K. 5:7; 19:14 = Isa. 37:14; 2 K. 22:8,16; Jer. 51:63; possibly Isa. 34:16), or aloud, so that others may hear them (Josh. 8:34-35). In some passages the phrase *lipnê/b^e'oznê* ("before/in the ears of") + object makes clear that the reading is loud and public, so that the substance of what is read can be understood (Ex. 24:7; 2 K. 22:10; 23:2; Jer. 29:29; 36:15,21;

65. Elliger, *BK* XI/1, 232; R. P. Merendino, *SVT* 31 (1981), 242, with reasons; C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1969), 99.

66. H. Ringgren, *The Religions of the Ancient Near East* (Eng. trans. Philadelphia, 1973), 37, 100, 169-73.

67. E. Haag, citing H. Haag, *Der Gottesknecht bei Deuterojesaja. EdF* 233 (1985), 15.

68. Labuschagne, 672.

2 Ch. 34:18,24,30; Neh. 8:3; Dt. 31:11; cf. also Est. 6:1 and Neh. 13:1, with the niphal of *qārā'*). The book or other object from which something is to be read or recited is introduced by *bᵉ* (Dt. 17:19; Neh. 8:8,18; 9:3; Jer. 36:6,8,10,13,14; Hab. 2:2). The subject doing the reading varies: Moses, Joshua, Baruch, Ezra, kings of Israel or Judah; the people are also called upon to read (usually the law). What is read or recited (from) also varies widely. In 2 K. 5:7 (from the core stratum);[69] 19:14 (Dtr) = Isa. 37:14 (late preexilic); and Jer. 29:29 (Dtr), a messenger delivers a letter,[70] which the addressee then reads (probably in a low voice). Only in Jer. 29:29 does *bᵉ'oznê* indicate explicitly that Zephaniah reads aloud to Jeremiah the letter addressed to him (cf. Est. 6:1 [reading from the *sēp̱er hazzikrōnôṯ*]; Isa. 29:11-12).

2. *The Law.* In 2 K. 22–23 par. 2 Ch. 34, the account of the discovery of the book of the law (*sēp̱er hattôrâ;* probably the Dtn law in Dt. 12–26*), *qārā'* is used several times as a technical term for reading or recitation. In 2 K. 22:8 the high priest Hilkiah gives the law book discovered in the house of Yahweh to the secretary Shaphan, who then reads it (to himself). Shaphan then reads it aloud (*qārā' lip̱nê,* v. 10 par. 2 Ch. 34:18) to King Josiah. This book read by the king (v. 16) or in his presence (2 Ch. 34:18) is authenticated by the prophetess Huldah as the commandment of God. His hearing of this law book persuades Josiah to read it (2 K. 23:2) to the elders of Judah (*ziqnê yᵉhûḏâ* [core stratum: the other segments of the population are an addition of DtrN[71]]); finally, this reading leads the king to make a covenant (*kāraṯ bᵉrîṯ,* v. 3 par. 2 Ch. 34:31), the crucial result of the book's discovery. The public recitation of the law plays a central role, for it is important to DtrN in v. 2 alongside the elders to name as hearers the priests, prophets, and all the people. Here, as in Ex. 24:7 (Dtr), recitation of the book (*sēper habbᵉrîṯ*)[72] imposes an obligation on the people.

Ex. 24:7 so fuses the public reading, the making of the covenant, and the accompanying sacrifice that the reading takes on a cultic function as part of the covenant ceremony. On this basis recitation of law becomes an essential part of the Feast of Booths during the year of remission (Dt. 31:11). The eminence of the reader (Moses, Joshua, Ezra) also adds significance to the recitation of the law. In Josh. 8:34-35 (late Dtr), it is Joshua who reads *kol-diḇrê hattôrâ habbᵉrāḵâ wᵉhaqqᵉlālâ* to the *qᵉhal yiśrā'ēl*[73] in the context of building an altar, underlining the authority of the words of the law. This action on Joshua's part is entirely consonant with the "ideal of the king who keeps the law and makes the covenant,"[74] since Dtn ideology makes a point of the king's reading of the *tôrâ* (Dt. 17:19, in the law governing the kingship).

Public recitation of law books presupposes their canonization in fixed written form; historically, therefore, it is especially relevant to the exilic and postexilic period; this

69. "An ancient anecdote": E. Würthwein, *Könige II. ATD* XI/2 (1984), 299.
70. → ספר *sāpar.*
71. H. Spieckermann, *Juda unter Assur in der Sargonidenzeit. FRLANT* 129 (1982), passim.
72. → X, 333ff.
73. → קהל *qāhāl.*
74. L. Perlitt, *Die Bundestheologie im AT. WMANT* 36 (1969), 43 n. 2.

observation supports its association with the Dtr corpus.[75] This development institutionalizes reading the *tôrâ,* as well as keeping *(šāmar)* it and acting *('āśâ)* according to its dictates, although the people are reminded frequently of their obligation to observe it in quite a different fashion (cf., e.g., Dt. 6:6ff.; 11:18ff.).

3. *Neh. 8–9.* Thus we see that the reading of the law in the story of Ezra (Neh. 8–9) also represents a fixed institution. In the cycle of annual festivals, the approach of the seventh month marks the time for all the people to gather before the Water Gate, to ask Ezra to bring the book of the law of Moses (8:1), from which he then reads *(qārā')* to the men, women, and all who could hear with understanding *(mᵉḇînîm).* This reading encompasses the Pentateuch or portions of it; it took place in the context of worship, which lent it constitutive significance for establishing the cultic community. Here Ezra plays two roles: as a "priest," he brings the *tôrâ* to the community; as a "scribe," he mounts a kind of platform (*migdal-'ēṣ,* v. 4) to read and expound it. A liturgy of the word in which the *tôrâ* was read and expounded is characteristic of synagogue worship in the postexilic period.[76] Recitation and observation of the written law are already emphasized in Dtr material; this emphasis is here extended and elevated to ritual status, giving rise to the tradition in which today's liturgy still stands.

During the Feast of Booths (Neh. 8:13-18), the reading of the law is prescribed throughout all seven days of the festival (v. 18); a three-hour reading of the *sēp̱er tôraṯ yhwh 'ᵉlōhîm* is also a constitutive element of the penitential liturgy on the 24th day of the same month (Neh. 9:1-5). Isa. 34:16 (a postexilic addition) speaks of a "book of Yahweh" *(sēp̱er yhwh)* from which the words of Yahweh can be read.

4. *Jer. 36.* Jer. 36 records the burning of the scroll dictated to Baruch by Jeremiah. Most of this account goes back to the scribe Baruch (vv. 3,7,31 being Dtr[77]); in the chapter *qārā'* occurs 12 times, twice in the sense of "dictate" (vv. 4,18, where Jeremiah dictates the contents of the scroll) and 10 times in the sense of "read (aloud)" (vv. 6 [twice],8,10,13,14,15 [twice],21,23). The subject of the verb is Baruch (Jehudi in vv. 21,23); the listeners include all the people of Judah (*kol-yᵉhûḏâ,* v. 6) or the people (*hā'ām,* vv. 10,13,14) who have come to Jerusalem to observe the fast (v. 9), as well as the royal officials (*kol-haśśārîm,* vv. 14-15) and the king (Jehoiakim) himself (vv. 21,23). Jeremiah cannot read the words in person because he is *'āṣûr* (v. 5) and is thus denied admittance to the temple (cf. Jer. 33:1; 39:15). Probably the chamber in which Baruch read the scroll opened onto the court, so that his words could be heard outside.[78] This public reading had its effect: Baruch is taken before the *śārîm* (vv. 14-20), where he reads the contents of the scroll once more. All we can say about the meaning

---

75. On the law governing the king (Dt. 17:14-20) see also U. Rüterswörden, *Von der politischen Gemeinschaft zur Gemeinde. BBB* 65 (1987), 50-66.

76. For a detailed discussion see A. H. J. Gunneweg, *Nehemia. KAT* XIX/2 (1987), 108ff.

77. W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26–45. WMANT* 52 (1981), 49ff.

78. W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* XII (^{3}1968), 233.

of *qārā'* in this context is that it refers to "reading" in a purely technical sense: what matters is the substance of what is read, not the act of reading as such. This account differs markedly from Neh. 8 (recitation of the *tôrâ* in synagogue worship): there is no cultic context.

An injunction to read publicly the contents of Jeremiah's scroll (*sēp̱er 'eḥāḏ,* v. 60) appears once more in Jer. 51:59-64, a secondary appendix to the book. Here, as in Jer. 36, *qārā'* is in the first instance a purely technical term. In addition, however, this public reading functions as a prophetic threat (v. 64).

Hossfeld/Lamberty-Zielinski

VII. Naming. In many texts *qārā'* is a technical term for naming. It serves this function throughout the entire OT. In the earliest occurrences of *qārā'* (Gen. 2:19; 4:17,25,26; etc.) as well as in occurrences to be dated very late (Est. 9:26; Zec. 11:7; Mal. 1:4; Ruth 4:17; 1 Ch. 4:9; 7:16,23; 13:11; 2 Ch. 3:17; 20:26), the verb is used as a term for naming. The book of Genesis contains a striking concentration of such occurrences.

1. *General.* A variety of constructions are used for naming: the two commonest are *qārā'* + l^e + object (often a city, town, or the like) and *qārā'* + *šēm* + suffix or object (usually but by no means always a person). As a rare variant of the first construction we find *qārā'* + *šēm* + l^e + object denoting the entity named (Gen. 2:20; Isa. 62:2 [pual]; 65:15; Ruth 4:17). There is also the possibility of using the verb with two accusative objects (the naming and the name: Gen. 26:33; Nu. 32:41; Isa. 43:22; Jer. 46:17; Ezk. 10:13 [pual]; 39:11; Hos. 2:18[16]). Naming something after oneself is expressed by *qārā' 'al-š^emô* (Dt. 3:14; 2 S. 18:18; Ps. 49:12[11]; but cf. Gen. 48:6). In one unique passage the absolute use of *qārā' šēm* emphasizes the person of the name giver (Ruth 4:11).[79]

All these constructions emphasize the punctiliar act of naming. If instead the emphasis is on the durative aspect of having a name, niphal expressions are available that correspond to the various qal constructions: (a) *yiqqārē'* + l^e + named entity (Gen. 2:23; Dt. 3:13; 1 S. 9:9; 2 S. 18:18; Isa. 1:26; 32:5; 35:8; 62:4,12; Jer. 19:6; Prov. 16:21); (b) *niqrā'* + named entity (Isa. 54:5; 56:7; 61:6; Zec. 8:3; (c) *niqrā'* + *šēm* + suffix + name (Gen. 17:5; 35:10; Ezk. 20:29; Dnl. 10:1). The subject is always implicit in the verb, so that attention shifts from the name giver to the named entity, and the aspect of having a name is emphasized. On rare occasions naming can be expressed by *qārā' b^ešēm* (Nu. 32:38; Josh. 21:9; Isa. 48:1; 1 Ch. 6:50[65]).

As a punctiliar event in the past, naming is represented by *x-qāṯal-* or *wayyiqṭōl* forms (Gen. 16:14; 19:22; 4:17,25,26; double occurrences in inverted sequence: Gen. 1:5,10; 31:47; 35:18). The aspect of having a name as a durative characteristic is expressed by *w^eqāṭal* and *x-yiqṭōl* forms (e.g., Gen. 27:36). These forms can also describe future events (namings) (Isa. 47:1,5; 54:5; 56:7; 58:5).

---

79. C. J. Labuschagne, *ZAW* 79 (1967) 364-67.

The act of naming appears primarily in early texts (Pentateuch, Dtr History), whereas having a name is commoner in exilic and postexilic texts. The theory of Fichtner that a name serves to define the nature of the entity named must be modified along the lines indicated by van der Woude;[80] in any case a name does far more than simply label and distinguish different entities. The act of naming and the possession of a name are thus matters of great import.

2. *Creation.* The creation narratives differ in their use of *qārā'* to describe the naming of the created world. The most important difference is in the subject and object of the naming, reflecting differing understandings of the act of naming. In J, Yahweh leaves to the human the task of naming the birds and animals he has created (Gen. 2:19-20); the text expresses a fundamental human autonomy "within a certain limited area."[81] The authority to give names shows clearly how human abilities and opportunities may be realized. What makes the human being unique is that through the act of naming he creates his own world, constituting it through an "act of appropriative ordering."[82]

Little of this very "modern" picture of humanity may be found in P. The naming of the created world is reserved to *'ᵉlōhîm* (Gen. 1:5,8,10; 5:2). The act denoted by *qārā'* no longer involves a human being but only God the creator, who distinguishes and names. This is particularly clear in 5:2: *'āḏām* no longer names, but is named by *'ᵉlōhîm*. The bestowal of the generic name *'āḏām* shows that God's purpose in creating humankind remains in God's own hands; at the same time, P here signals the beginning of the story of *'ᵉlōhîm* and humanity.

Zenger attempts to contrast the naming formula *qārā'* + *šēm* + suffix or object named with the other expression *qārā'* + *lᵉ* + suffix or object named, used in P's creation account, interpreting the latter as a call formula: God appoints to light, darkness, firmament, dry land, and gathered waters quite specific offices within the created world as the locus of life.[83] A survey of other passages that use the latter expression does not support this interpretation. Even though elsewhere P prefers the formula with *šēm* to denote the giving of a name, especially the name of a person, other strata and books clearly use the formula with *lᵉ* as a naming formula (2:19,20;[84] persons, 35:18; 1 S. 4:21; places, Gen. 16:14; 33:20 [probably P]; Nu. 32:42; etc.). At most, the evidence shows that P consistently uses different formulas for the naming of persons and the naming of abstract entities. One cannot draw more far-reaching conclusions from the formula as such.

3. *Subject.* The naming of persons raises the question of who does the naming. We note at once that in a substantial number of cases the mother names her child imme-

80. Fichtner, 372; van der Woude, 937-38.
81. C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11*, 228.
82. G. von Rad, *Genesis. ATD* II-IV (1985), 58.
83. E. Zenger, *Gottes Bogen in den Wolken. SBS* 112 (1983), 55 n. 15.
84. C. Dohmen, *Schöpfung und Tod. SBB* 17 (1988), 79 n. 133.

diately after birth (Gen. 4:25; 16:11 [Yahweh's instructions to Hagar]; 19:37,38; 29:32,33,35; 30:6,8,11,13,18,20,21,24; 35:18; 38:3,4,5; Jgs. 13:24; 1 S. 1:20; 4:21; 1 Ch. 4:9; 7:16). Most of the texts in the Pentateuch can be assigned to J. The texts in which the father names the child more often belong to later strata (P: Gen. 5:3; 16:15; 21:3; Joseph story: Gen. 38:29-30; J: Gen. 4:26; 5:29; Ex. 2:22; other: 2 S. 12:24-25). It would be wrong, however, to see in this difference a shift from matriarchal to patriarchal social organization.[85] We must assume instead that the mother normally chose her child's name; the exceptions are to be explained as literary reinterpretations diverging from the normal practice, intended to emphasize a particular interest.

Comparison of Gen. 16:11 and 16:15 provides a clear illustration. In 16:15 (P) it is Abraham who names the child, whereas v. 11 (J) would have led us to expect that Hagar, the child's mother, would name him. Kessler interprets this difference against the background of a distinction between a birth narrative, interested in the concrete details of pregnancy, birth, and naming, and a genealogy, the purpose of which is to establish patrilineal descent. Thus v. 15 represents a deliberate alteration of the story on the part of P, showing (in accordance with the purpose of genealogies) that Ishmael is a legitimate son of Abraham and thus the bearer of a promise. The other instances where P describes a father as naming his child can be explained in a similar fashion.

Further evidence that the normal practice was for a mother to name her child is the observation that the feminine forms *wattiqrā'* and *qārᵉ'â* are always associated with a woman who does the naming, whereas the masculine forms *wayyiqrā'* and *qārā'* can be used impersonally (Gen. 25:25,26,30; 29:34; 38:29,30). The preference of the Tamar novella for the impersonal formulation, which does not identify the person who does the naming, instead of the unambiguous feminine form Kessler ascribes to the fact that Tamar is a gentile woman (cf. also Ex. 2:22; Gen. 41:51,52: the wives of Moses and Joseph are likewise Gentiles, and therefore it is the father who chooses the name). The naming of a child was clearly restricted to Israelite mothers.

That the father is instructed to name his child in Hos. 1:4,6,9 and Isa. 8:3 is probably evidence that an oracle of Yahweh can abrogate normal practice.

4. *Etiologies.* Etiologies are associated with naming in the Pentateuch (esp. in Genesis, less frequently in Exodus and Numbers); there are also 15 instances distributed though the various books of the Dtr History, as well as 5 in 1 and 2 Chronicles, 1 in Ruth, and 1 in Esther. Generally it is a person or place that is named; etiologies also explain the generic term *'iššâ* (Gen. 2:23), the bitter water in the wilderness (Ex. 15:23), and the festival of Purim (Est. 9:26). The texts in the Pentateuch can all be assigned to J; Fichtner makes the interesting observation that P records without etiology the naming of many persons and places that have etiological explanations in other sources.[86]

85. Kessler.
86. P. 377.

Fichtner ascribes the waning interest in name etiologies in the later strata of the OT tradition to a change in the historiographic approach of these strata.

According to Heller, most OT name interpretations are linguistically quite untenable.[87] But this fact immediately raises theological issues: "The more bizarre and linguistically impossible the biblical interpretation of a name, the better material it provides for theological inquiry." Heller is probably correct in suggesting that the biblical interpretations of names are not "naive popular etymologies" but interpretations, perhaps originating in the preliterary period, but endowed with intentional kerygmatic content in the setting of the written narrative or reshaped in the process of transmission. Heller uses the term "etymologization" for this tendentious interpretation of proper names without regard for their actual etymology. Although this tendentious purpose provides a point of departure, systematic use of such interpretation in connection with naming is found only in J, where an explanation accompanies the naming of every important figure (Eve, Gen. 3:20; Seth, 4:25; Noah, 5:29; Moab and Ben-ammi, 19:37,38; Jacob's first eleven sons, 29:32-35; 30:6,8,11,13,18,20,24; Benjamin, 35:18).[88]

Fichtner distinguishes two basic forms of "etymological" etiology associated with naming, preserved in pure form only in the earliest strata of tradition. Form I uses the naming formula *wayyiqrā'/wattiqrā' šᵉmô/šᵉmāh* + name, followed by an etymological interpretation usually introduced by "for she/he said/thought . . ." (persons, Gen. 4:25; 5:29; 19:37-38; 29:32-33; 30:8,11,13,18,20-21,24; 35:18; 38:29-30; Ex. 2:10,22; Jgs. 6:32; 1 S. 1:20; 4:21; 2 S. 12:25; places, Gen. 26:20ff.; 28:19; 32:31[30]; Ex. 17:7; Nu. 11:3; Josh. 5:9; 19:47; 22:34; Jgs. 1:17; 2:5; 1 S. 7:12; 2 S. 6:8; 1 K. 9:13). Form II, by contrast, generally recounts a specific event taking place at a specific place, followed by the naming of this place: *'al-kēn qārā'* . . . (places, Gen. 11:9; 16:14; 19:22; 21:31; 31:48; 33:17; 50:11; Ex. 15:23; Josh. 7:25; Jgs. 15:19; 1 S. 23:28; 2 S. 5:20; persons, Gen. 25:30; 29:34-35; 30:6).

Form I is found primarily in personal etiologies, especially in contexts where the focus of the narrative is on the naming. Form II is used almost exclusively for the etiology of toponyms; the narrative focuses on the event memorialized in the naming (e.g., the naming of the city of Babel, Gen. 11:9[89]). Etiological naming narratives present themselves theologically as "tidings of God's saving acts with respect to certain individuals and places."[90]

A borderline form of etiological interpretation is the giving of a symbolic name; such naming appears primarily in the prophetic books and takes place at Yahweh's command: Isa. 7:14 (Immanuel); Hos. 1:4 (Jezreel); 1:6 (Lo-ruhamah); 1:9 (Lo-ammi).

5. *Renaming.* P substitutes for etiologies the theologically significant renaming of central figures of the patriarchal narrative (Abram renamed Abraham, Gen. 17:5; Sarai

87. P. 261.
88. Fichtner, 387; van der Woude, 946.
89. C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11*, 553-54; Heller, 259.
90. Fichtner, 359-60.

renamed Sarah, 17:15; Jacob renamed Israel, 35:10; cf. 32:29[28]; Moses' change of Hoshea's name to Joshua, Nu. 13:16). These texts use *qārā'* for the act of renaming. In the patriarchal narrative it is always Yahweh who initiates the change. In Gen. 17:5 and 35:10, the use of *qārā'* (niphal) *šēm* for the earlier name underlines the durative aspect of bearing a name; for the act of giving a new name, by contrast, the texts use *qārā' šēm* (Gen. 17:15; 35:10). In the prophets (Isa. 62:4; Jer. 19:6; 20:3) and in Ruth 1:20, we also find examples of a change of name for symbolic purposes. Here too belongs the promise of a new but unspecified name (Isa. 62:2; 65:15).[91]

The change of Joseph's name to Zaphenath-paneah in Gen. 41:45a is to be understood as a mark of special honor on the part of Pharaoh,[92] albeit this is the only mention of Joseph's Egyptian name.

6. *Appellations.* In the prophetic books (esp. Isaiah), the act of naming takes a back seat to the bearing of a name as an ongoing state, expressed grammatically by the frequent use of niphal forms (Isa. 1:26; 35:8; 54:5; 56:7; 61:6; 62:12; Zec. 8:3; etc.). In most instances the qal forms, too, lack a clearly specified subject; they should therefore be understood impersonally and translated as passives (Isa. 47:1,5; 58:12; 60:14; 61:3; 62:12; Jer. 3:17; 6:30; 30:17; 33:16; Ezk. 39:11; Mal. 1:4). The expression *qārā' l^e* is used more often for naming than is *qārā' šēm,* which is reserved for the naming of individuals. The combination *qārā'* + *šēm* + *l^e* + object (Isa. 62:2; 65:15) lends the naming special weight.

These names are usually borne by abstract entities and are no longer proper names in the strict sense, but titles meant to emphasize a function, attribute, or characteristic feature. Examples: a road in the desert is called "holy way" (Isa. 35:8); daughter Babylon will no longer be called "tender and delicate" (47:1); daughter Chaldea will no longer be called "mistress of kingdoms" (47:5); the temple ("my house") will be called "house of prayer for all peoples" (56:7); those who mourn in Zion will be called "oaks of righteousness" (61:3); Pharaoh will be called "braggart who missed his chance" (Jer. 46:17). Instead of such a title, an attribute may be named directly: the fool will no longer be called noble (Isa. 32:5); the "house of Jacob" is called a "rebel from birth" (Isa. 48:8); the wise of heart is called perceptive (Prov. 16:21).

We frequently find appellations for Jerusalem: "citadel of righteousness" (Isa. 1:26), "throne of Yahweh" (Jer. 3:17), "city of the Lord" (Isa. 60:14), "salvation" (walls, 60:18), "sought out, a city not forsaken" (62:12), "Yahweh our righteousness" (Jer. 33:16); "faithful city" (Zec. 8:3); "outcast" (no longer: Jer. 30:17). These titles give voice to an assurance of coming salvation; note their concentration in Trito-Isaiah.

7. *qārā' b^ešēm.* Nu. 32:38; Josh 21:9; 1 Ch. 6:50(65) (all late texts) use the formula *qārā' b^ešēm* for the mentioning of towns by name.

In Isa. 48:1 the NRSV interprets the participial construction *hanniqrā'îm b^ešēm*

91. See below.
92. Van der Woude, 944.

yiśrā'ēl as a formula for calling by name, translating it: "You who are called by the name of Israel." Westermann leaves the interpretation unresolved.[93]

Hossfeld/Kindl

VIII. Property Law. The idiom *niqrā' šēm 'al,* "the name is invoked upon," expresses the concept of ownership in a legal and theological sense. It occurs 21 times. Once it appears with the entity upon which the name is invoked as its object; after *'al* (e.g., 2 Ch. 6:33), however, it is also possible (and much more common) to name the object in an appended attributive clause introduced by *'ašer* (e.g., Jer. 7:10-11,14,30). With only two exceptions (2 S. 12:28, Joab; Isa. 4:1, a man), it is the name of Yahweh that is invoked. The objects include Israel (Dt. 28:10; Isa. 63:19; Jer. 14:9 [Judah]; 2 Ch. 7:14), the ark of God (2 S. 6:2; 1 Ch. 13:6), the house (temple) (1 K. 8:43; Jer. 7:10-11,14,30; 32:34; 34:15; 2 Ch. 6:33), and Jerusalem and other cities (Jer. 15:16; 25:29; Dnl. 9:18-19). The primary locus of the formula is the Dtr material.[94]

In 2 S. 12:28 Joab as the commander of David's army urges his king to take the captured city, to prevent Joab's name from being invoked upon the city so that it would belong to him (cf. also Jer. 25:29; Dnl. 9:18-19). By ancient military custom the one whose name is invoked upon a city becomes its possessor. Should David not advance to take Rabbah (v. 29), Joab would be king of the city. The act of pronouncing a name to claim possession of something is attested in Akkadian documents;[95] following Boecker, we may characterize it as the "conclusion of a purchase" (contra Galling, who views the proclamation of the owner's name as giving a chance for other claimants to present their case).[96] Proclamation of the new owner's name finalizes the change of ownership.

The second purely secular text, Isa. 4:1, describes a time of disaster when women will cling to a single man, whose name is pronounced upon them. According to Boecker, this act represents the "final ratification of a marriage contract," through which the woman finds a degree of protection.[97] Here, as in 2 S. 12:28, the idiom describes the establishment of a relationship of ownership and hence protection (the woman becomes the property of the man, who is therefore responsible for her), not the change of the woman's name to that of the man. According to Israelite law, a woman kept her own name when she married.[98]

Yahweh is the owner of the ark (*'arôn hā'ᵉlōhîm,* 2 S. 6:2; 1 Ch. 13:6). The invocation of Yahweh's name characterizes it as *šēm yhwh ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ yōšēḇ hakkᵉruḇîm 'ālāyw.* Thus the cultic name *yhwh ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ,* already in use at the Shiloh sanctuary, was transferred to the cultic site in Jerusalem antedating the temple. In consequence, the temple *(hêḵal yhwh),* the house of Yahweh (*habbayiṯ,* 1 K. 8:43 = 2 Ch. 6:33; Jer. 7:10-

93. C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66,* 196-97.
94. See also M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford, 1972), 325.
95. References in Thiel, *Jeremia 1–25,* 111 n. 27.
96. Boecker, 166-67.
97. *Ibid.,* 168.
98. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1991), 160, with bibliog.

11,14,30; 32:34; 34:15), is described as having the name of Yahweh invoked upon it. This act defines the legal ownership and the inviolability of the object, from which the people leap to the erroneous conclusion that this inviolability guarantees safety and security (Jer. 7:1-15). Their conclusion proves deceptive (v. 8), for Yahweh makes establishment of the temple as a place of refuge conditional on various requirements (vv. 5-7) that recall the ordinances of Deuteronomy (e.g., 19:10; 24:12ff.; 27:19) and the Covenant Code (e.g., Ex. 20:22-23). If the people decide not to obey Yahweh's will (vv. 9-11), their actions profane the name of Yahweh. Jer. 7:30 and 32:34 also qualify idolatry as desecration of the temple. All in all, Jeremiah makes quite clear that the temple, as Yahweh's property and dwelling place, is part of the covenant relationship between Yahweh and his people (cf. also Jer. 34:15), so that profanation of the temple is tantamount to breaking the covenant. The temple represents the presence of Yahweh in the midst of the people and demands that their conduct follow the dictates of the law.

Just as the temple is Yahweh's property, so too can Israel (or in one text a prophet: Jer. 15:16) be considered Yahweh's property when Yahweh's name is invoked upon it (Dt. 28:10; Isa. 63:19; Jer. 14:9 [Judah]; 2 Ch. 7:14). This invocation presupposes Israel's readiness to hearken to the voice of Yahweh. As a consequence, Yahweh will set his people high above all the nations of the earth (*ntn ʿal kol-gōyê hāʾāreṣ,* Dt. 28:1). In other words they will be blessed and privileged above all other nations (28:1-14). The concrete effects demonstrate the results of the covenant relationship with its mutual obligations (2 Ch. 7:14; Jer. 14:9; Isa. 63:19).

This theological variant of the invocation of Yahweh's name upon Israel far transcends a purely material declaration of ownership; it proclaims the relationship between Yahweh and Israel to be virtually that of a mutual partnership.

Hossfeld/Lamberty-Zielinski

IX. *miqrāʾ*. The noun *miqrāʾ* occurs 23 times in the OT; its distribution is limited to the books of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Isaiah, and Nehemiah. It appears with striking frequency (11 times) in Leviticus. Formally, it is an abstract verbal infinitive with the prefix *ma-;* its basic meaning, accordingly, is "the (act of) calling out."[99] The phrase *miqrāʾ-qōḏeš* (with its pl. *miqrāʾê qōḏeš*) occurs 19 times in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers. There is one occurrence each of the phrases *miqrāʾ hāʿēḏâ* (Nu. 10:2) and *qᵉrōʾ miqrāʾ* (Isa. 1:13). In Isa. 4:5 emendation of *miqrāʾehā* to *miqrāʾêhā* does not improve the sense.[100] The simple form *miqrāʾ* occurs only in Neh. 8:8.

The phrase *miqrāʾ-qōḏeš* refers to the "sacred (cultic) assembly" (constituted by being called together) during the Festival of Unleavened Bread (Ex. 12:15-20 [P]). Originally a harvest festival, this feast coalesced with the Dtn Passover (Dt. 16:1-7), was shifted to the context of the exodus, and became subject to specific regulations. One of its features is a *miqrāʾ-qōḏeš* on the first and last (seventh) days of the observance (v. 16). Apart from preparation of food, no work may be performed on these days, a

99. *BLe,* §43h; see also Kutsch, 249.
100. Cf. *BHK.* Note that *BHS* does not even mention the variant.

prohibition giving the day characterized by a *miqrā'-qōdeš* equal status with the Sabbath.

In the account of Israel's journey through the wilderness, Nu. 28–29 (P) lays down the regulations concerning sacrifices and festivals that were obligatory of the cultic community in Jerusalem. Here too a *miqrā'-qōdeš* (28:18,25) is summoned on the first and last days of the Festival of Unleavened Bread. The rest from labor is expressed in more concrete terms: *m^e le'ket ^{ca}bōdâ,* i.e., "daily work," is prohibited.[101] In its place various sacrifices are prescribed (vv. 19-24). The same regulations govern the festival of weeks (v. 26), as well as the festival of the New Year and the festival of atonement (Nu. 29). Here a *miqrā'-qōdeš* is to take place on the first (v. 1), tenth (v. 7), and fifteenth (v. 12) days; the first day is also distinguished by a "trumpet blast" *(t^e rû'â)* expressive of rejoicing. The original festival lasted "only" seven days (v. 12); to it there was attached a special eighth day marked by a solemn assembly (v. 35; here called *^{ca}ṣereṯ*) and rest from labor.[102]

Lev. 23, a late and much edited text,[103] contains regulations and ordinances governing the celebration of all the festivals of Yahweh *(mô^{ca}ḏê yhwh)* known in Israel. For each of them this systematic listing requires a *miqrā'-qōdeš* at specified times. Here, in striking contrast to Ex. 12, both Passover and the Festival of Unleavened Bread are included. This compendium is introduced and concluded by the statement that it deals with the festivals that are "proclaimed as days of a holy assembly" (*qārā' miqrā'ê-qōdeš,* vv. 2,37). That all the festivals were not interpreted and observed in precisely the same way is clear from the context: the festival of atonement, for example, to be observed for all generations (v. 31), requires additional self-denial (vv. 27,32).

These regulations (all unique to P) define the *miqrā'* as an exclusive cultic assembly restricted to the greatest festivals, thus distinguishing it from the *qāhāl,*[104] which appears in early and late source strata (including P) in the basic sense of "convocation" (contrast Dtn and Dtr usage), and from *'ēḏâ,*[105] which is used similarly by all source strata for the "general assembly" of all free adult males, convoked to make decisions affecting the entire nation.[106]

Thus *'ēḏâ* is primarily a political term; the expression *miqrā' hā'ēḏâ* in Nu. 10:2 (P) is to be interpreted both grammatically and semantically as a hybrid term for an assembly that is both political and cultic.

Isa. 1:13 is hard to place. While Wildberger assumes Isaianic authorship of Isa. 1:10-17, Kaiser and Kilian assign it to the postexilic period.[107] The combination of new

---

101. *HAL,* III, 629.

102. → XII, 314. For a discussion of the similarities and differences in meaning between *^{ca}ṣereṯ* and *miqrā',* see Kutsch.

103. See, e.g., K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* IV (1966), 302ff.; A. Cholewiński, *Heiligkeitsgesetz und Deuteronomium. AnBibl* 66 (1976), 82ff.

104. → XII, 546ff.

105. → X, 468ff.

106. → X, 470.

107. Wildberger, 39; Kaiser, 39ff.; Kilian, 23.

moon *(ḥōdeš)*, Sabbath *(šabbāṯ)*, and *miqrā'* is striking. If we assume that the preexilic Sabbath was a festival of the full moon, a preexilic date for this combination is quite plausible. From the cultic perspective, in this context *miqrā'* could refer to an assembly on the occasion of some festival whose nature is not described. We are probably dealing here with festal or penitential observances that do "not yet" have a fixed place in the calendar.[108]

In Isa. 4:5 (clearly postexilic) *miqrā'* denotes a festival site on Mt. Zion that will be Yahweh's place of assembly for the "sacred remnant" (cf. Ex. 13:21-22; 14:19-20).

In contrast to the usage discussed above, in Neh. 8:8 *miqrā'* denotes the reading of the *tôrâ* in the context of synagogue worship.[109] With this starting point, the practice of reciting portions of the Bible on Sabbaths and festivals led to the use of *miqrā'* as a technical term (alongside others) for the Jewish Scriptures. Already in Middle Hebrew, *miqrā'* is used for the reading or recitation of liturgical texts, for the Bible as a book, and for individual Bible verses.[110]

Lamberty-Zielinski

X. Dead Sea Scrolls. The 40 occurrences of the verb and 6 occurrences of the adjective in the Dead Sea Scrolls published to date follow the usage of the OT. Yahweh or Yahweh's name is invoked in prayer (11QPs^a 24[Ps. 155]:3,16; 4Q381 fr. 15, 9); the psalmist's assurance that he will be heard finds expression in 4Q381 fr. 24, 8: "In the day of my distress I will cry to Yahweh *('qr' lyhwh)*, and my God will answer me." A curse is pronounced upon the men of Belial's lot: "May God not be merciful when you cry to him" (1QS 2:8). In prayers the close relationship between Yahweh (a lord or protector) and his saints or the city of Jerusalem finds expression in his name being invoked upon them *(nqr'*, 4QDibHam^a 2:12; 4Q380 fr. 1, 1:5). Roughly 10 occurrences of the verb (as well as the 6 occurrences [some reconstructed] of the verbal adjective) have the meaning "call" or "be called." Yahweh calls his own despite their sin (4QDibHam^a [4Q504] frs. 1-2, 2:15); he calls the tottering to wondrous deeds (1QM 14:5). The elect of the eschaton are already called by name *(qry'y [h]šm*, CD 2:11; 4:4). In 1QSa 1:27; 2:2,11,13 we find the rules and regulations for those called to the assembly *(mw'd)* or the council of the community *('ṣt hyḥd)*. A unit of the army of the sons of light bears the title "called of God" *(qrw'y 'l*, 1QM 3:2; 4:10; 4QM^f 8:9); in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice the highest angels bear the title *qrw'y rwm rwmym* (4Q403 fr. 2, 2; 4Q407 fr. 1, 4; 4QMasShirShab 1:12).

The subject of *qr'* may be the God of Israel, who summons a sword against all the nations (1QM 16:1), who calls the inhabitants of the land of Damascus "princes" (CD 6:6) and Israel "my firstborn son" (4QDibHam^a frs. 1-2, 3:5-6).[111] Other subjects include Melchizedek, who proclaims an amnesty *(drwr*, 11QMelch 2:6, with a statement

108. Wildberger, 45.
109. See VI.3 above.
110. *WTM*, III, 228-230.
111. See VII above.

of purpose),[112] the priest who recites the prayer before battle (1QM 15:4), and the men of the council who are to recite the law (1QSa 1:4).

Finally, a few passages speak of "reading (in) the book" (*qr' bspr,* 1QS 6:7; 7:1); CD 5:2 absolves David of transgressing the law, since he had not "read the sealed book of the law *(bspr twrh hḥtwm)* that was in the ark."

An interesting coalescence of biblical text with reception and interpretation[113] is illustrated by 4QpNah 1:8, which interprets Nah. 2:13(12) as a reference to Alexander Janneus, who was the first to employ crucifixion as a punishment;[114] the interpretation connects "the one hanged alive [!] on a tree" (*ltlwy ḥy 'l [h]'ṣ;* cf. Dt. 21:22) with Nah. 2:14(13) *(yqr'),* which is in turn given its own interpretation.[115]

Quotations from the OT appear in 11QT 2:13 (cf. Ex. 34:15); 59:6; 62:6 (cf. Dt. 20:10).

The noun *miqrā'* occurs 16 times. Its occurrences in the Temple Scroll (*mqr' qwdš,* 11QT 17:3,10; 18:3; 19:8; 25:3; 27:8) parallel Lev. 23; cf. also 4Q513 fr. 3, 1. All the other occurrences represent a specialized usage in 1QM, describing the inscriptions on the trumpets *(ḥṣwṣrwt)* of the "musters" (*mqr',* probably individual units: 3:1,2,3,7) belonging to the army of the sons of light. These "muster trumpets" are in the hands of the priests (7:13), who use them to order units to advance between the battle lines (7:15; 8:3; 9:3) or to order one line to relieve another (16:12).

Dahmen

---

112. See IV above.

113. → פשר *pešer.*

114. E. Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran* (Munich, [2]1971), 298.

115. → תלה *tālâ.*

קָרַב *qārab;* קָרֵב *qārēb;* קָרוֹב *qārôb;* קִרְבָה *qirbâ;* קְרָב *q^erāb* → קָרְבָּן *qorbān*

I. Lexicography. II. Meaning and Occurrences: 1. General; 2. Verb; 3. Participle; 4. *qārôb;* 5. Infinitive; 6. Nouns; 7. Aramaic; 8. Synonyms and Antonyms. III. Dead Sea Scrolls. IV. LXX.

---

qārab. Z. W. Falk, "Hebrew Legal Terms," *JSS* 5 (1960) 350-54; N. Fernández Marcos, "ἐλπίζειν or ἐγγίζειν? — in Prophetarum Vitae Fabulosae 12,9 and in the Septuagint," *VT* 30 (1980) 357-59; J.-G. Heintz, "Aux origines d'une expression biblique," *VT* 21 (1971) 528-40; Y. Hoffman, "The Root QRB as a Legal Term," *JNSL* 10 (1982) 67-73; J. Kühlewein, "קרב *qrb* sich nähern," *THAT,* II, 674-81; W. E. Lemke, "The Near and the Distant God," *JBL* 100 (1981) 541-55; J. A. Loader, "An Explanation of the Term *prosēlutos,*" *Novum Testamentum* 15 (1973) 270-77; J. Milgrom, *Studies in Levitical Terminology, I. The Encroacher and the Levite* (Berkeley, 1970), esp. 16-22, 33-43; D. S. Sfriso, *Adhaerere Deo* (1980).

I. Lexicography. The root *qrb* is found throughout the entire Semitic domain with the basic meaning "be near." The G stem of the verb often means "approach," and the causative, "bring near"; the adjective means "near." The motivation for being or bringing near varies, and may include hostile, sexual, or cultic intent. Nearness manifests itself as physical proximity to persons, places, or objects; but abstract concepts such as social relationships, legal rights, religious privileges, and words can also be considered near. Temporal nearness expresses imminence. Thus the root developed specialized meanings such as "have sexual intercourse," "infringe rights," "claim privileges," and "be qualified."

The following (partial) survey illustrates figurative usage of the root in the other Semitic languages. Akk. *qerēbu*[1] can denote sexual intercourse.[2] The D stem can mean "offer sacrifice" or "serve a meal to the gods." There is also a noun *taqribtu,* "offering."[3] The meaning is not simply "offer" in a general sense; the term has religious and cultic overtones. Prohibitive *qerēbu* can denote the overstepping of a boundary or the infringement of rights. Texts that forbid "approaching" fields or houses[4] refer in fact to encroaching on property rights.[5] In legal contexts *qerēbu* often means "assert a claim."[6] The noun *qerbu* denotes a relative, often together with *aḫu,* "brother."[7] The verb can also refer temporally to an imminent event, e.g., "my trip to the city is near."[8] With *ana* + infinitive, *qerēbu* means "begin to do something."[9] Old Assyr. *awātam qarrubum,* lit. "bring a word near," in effect means "address, speak to."[10] Several Akkadian nouns are connected with the notion of hostility.[11]

OSA *qrb* means both "approach" and "have sexual intercourse." The noun *qrbn,* "offering," refers to a religious sacrifice.

The causative of Ugar. *qrb* refers to the offering of sacrifice.[12] In the Aramaic Elephantine texts *qrb* can mean "assert a claim" in legal contexts, in contrast to *rḥq,* "distance oneself," i.e., relinquish property rights or claims.[13]

In the pael Syr. *qᵉrēb̲* can mean "offer (sacrifice)" or "utter (a request, a comment, or advice)." In the ethpael the verb can be used with reference to sexual intercourse; in the aphel it can mean "attack, wage war."[14]

1. *AHw,* II, 915-17; *CAD,* Q, 228-40.
2. *CAD,* Q, 233.
3. *AHw,* III, 1324.
4. *AHw,* II, 916, G.II.8.
5. Milgrom, 36.
6. *CAD,* Q, 234-35.
7. *Ibid.,* 215, 229.
8. *Ibid.,* 229.
9. *Ibid.,* 235-36.
10. *Ibid.,* 239.
11. Cf. II.6 below.
12. *WUS,* no. 2449; *UT,* no. 2268.
13. Y. Muffs, *Studies in the Aramaic Legal Papyri from Elephantine* (Leiden, 1969), 231; cf. Falk, 354.
14. *LexSyr,* 691.

II. Meaning and Occurrences.

1. *General.* The basic meaning of the Hebrew verb is "draw near" (qal, piel, hiphil), causatively "bring near" (piel, hiphil); the adj. *qārôḇ* means "near." We also find the ptcp./verbal adj. *qārēḇ* and the inf. *qirḇâ.* This basic meaning usually denotes physical, spatial proximity; but it can also denote temporal proximity, kinship, and the like. As in the other Semitic languages, coming or bringing near can have various motivations: hostile, cultic, legal,[15] sexual, etc.

Physical proximity of human beings to God is restricted (Ex. 3:5; cf. Josh. 3:4).[16] Access to holy objects and places is reserved to qualified cultic personnel,[17] although laypersons may approach Yahweh in the sanctuary (Lev. 9:5), offer (*qrb* hiphil) their sacrifices in its court (1:3), and, if ritually clean, touch objects of lesser sanctity (7:20). Outside the cult, the spatial nearness of God is experienced anthropomorphically when God helps human beings. God's name and word (commandment) are "accessible" to humans, and prayer can be metaphorical.

2. *Verb.* a. *Come Near.* Of the 93 occurrences of *qrb* in the qal, 71 (apart from the participle[18]) can be translated "come near." The subject is usually an individual or a group; other subjects include God (3 times: Lam. 3:57; Ps. 69:19[Eng. 18]; Mal. 3:5), a time (7 times), God's plan (once), and animals (once?).

(1) One may come near to see or hear. The motive may be curiosity (Ex. 3:5; cf. v. 3: "to look at the burning bush"), a desire to clarify a situation (Ex. 32:19: the golden calf), to find out how someone is (Gen. 37:18; cf. v. 14), or simply "to listen" (Eccl. 4:17[5:1]). In Gen. 37:18 and Ex. 32:19, a nearer approach is required by the limitations of vision (cf. *mērāḥōq* in Genesis). According to Eccl. 4:17(5:1), one should come to the temple to listen; nothing is said about the substance of what is heard. The text appears to suggest passive attention to what is going on.

(2) In five instances approaching involves a speech act (Nu. 31:48; Dt. 1:22; 5:23; Jon. 1:6; Est. 5:2). Two texts mention the coming near of the person addressed (2 S. 20:16-17, *qᵉraḇ ʿaḏ-hēnnâ,* "Come here"). In 2 S. 15:5 we are dealing with obeisance to the prince.

(3) One can come forward to carry out a task. In Lev. 10:4-5 Mishael and Elzaphan are commanded to come forward to remove the corpses of Nadab and Abihu from the sanctuary. Here *qrb* means simply "come" and "they came forward"; the solemn significance of the situation remains unexpressed, namely the need to remove the corpses from the sacred precincts. Exceptionally, in the cultic sphere here the coming near has no sacrificial motivation.

(4) In two cases someone comes near to offer help (Dt. 25:11; 1 K. 2:7). Lam. 3:57 and Ps. 69:19(18) state that God comes near to help or deliver.

(5) People may also come near with hostile intent; only in Isa. 54:14 do we find an

15. See Falk and Hoffman.
16. See Lemke.
17. See below.
18. See II.3 below.

abstract subject, "terror" (cf. the antithesis *rḥq/qrb:* "You shall be far from terror, it shall not come near you"). But this terror is associated with an attack by human enemies (v. 15). In 1 S. 17:48 it is an individual who draws near; elsewhere hostile groups are the subject of the verb. Dt. 2:37 says that the Israelites did not encroach on the territory of the Ammonites to conquer it. In Dt. 20:2 the Israelites "draw near to battle" temporally and spatially; in v. 10 they approach a town to attack it: here *qrb* refers only to preparations, not to the battle itself (see also Josh. 8:5; Jgs. 20:24; but cf. 1 K. 20:29[19]). The psalmist is threatened by the approaching enemy (Ps. 27:2; 119:150 [cf. v. 151, where God's nearness is a source of comfort]). In Josh. 10:24 (twice) the chiefs come near and put their feet on the necks of the Amorite kings as a gesture of victory.

(6) In eight passages *qrb* denotes the sexual act as a whole. In the four instances in Leviticus (all in legal contexts), the verb is accompanied by an expression specifying the sexual relationship. In 18:6,14,19, it is *lᵉgallôṯ ʿerwâ,* "to uncover nakedness," a phrase that this chapter uses in conjunction with *qrb* (20:18 par. 18:19 uses *šāḵaḇ* instead of *qrb*). In 20:16 we find *lᵉriḇʿâ ʾōṯâ,* "to have sexual relations with it [the animal]."

In the other instances the verb is used alone without further qualification. Dt. 22:14 deals with a bridegroom who discovers at first intercourse *(qrb ʾel)* that his bride is not a virgin. In Isa. 8:3 the result of *qrb ʾel* is conception. In Ezk. 18:6 (cf. Lev. 18:19) and Gen. 20:4 (cf. *ngʿ,* "touch," in v. 6), too, *qrb* by itself denotes a sexual act.

(7) In five instances the qal of *qrb* has a cultic connotation; four of these are in cultic contexts, one in a historical context. The subject is personal; in four cases the object is an altar. In 2 K. 16:12 Ahaz draws near (*ʿal* instead of *ʾel*) the altar and offers a burnt offering. The other texts involve the altar of the wilderness sanctuary, to which only the priests may draw near (Ex. 40:32; Lev. 9:7-8). This movement is nothing more than a physical approach, albeit serious and ceremonious. Only Lev. 9:5 reports that the whole congregation drew near and stood before Yahweh, i.e., before the tent of meeting; Aaron thereupon drew near to perform his priestly ministry (vv. 7-8).

(8) Zeph. 3:2 uses *qrb* in a general religious sense. The city of Nineveh is chastised for refusing to listen and to draw near to its God. Nineveh will not admit that it needs a relationship with God. Here "draw near" denotes a general religious attitude.

(9) The verb *qrb* is common in legal contexts.[20] In four instances persons draw near to other persons in an action at law. When a group comes before *(lip̱nê)* its leaders (always plural: Nu. 27:1-2; 36:1; Josh. 17:4), we are dealing with a formal appeal in a situation demanding an authoritative decision. When Israelites come to *(ʾel)* Moses alone, a legal decision is not involved (Nu. 31:48; Dt. 1:22; 5:23).

Individuals (or their cry: Ps. 119:169) can come before God (12 instances). Josh. 7:14 (*qrb* 3 times) describes an elimination process in which the guilty party is determined by sortilege. Here *qāraḇ* means "step forward" separately from the rest of the Is-

19. See below.
20. See Falk; Hoffman.

raelites. The process is guided by Yahweh (*ʾašer yilkᵉd̲ennû yhwh)* and Achan confesses his guilt (v. 20).

Eight texts (Ex. 16:9; Dt. 4:11; 5:27; Isa. 34:1; 41:1,5; 48:16; 57:3 [*qirb̲û hēnnâ,* "come here"]) describe a forensic drawing near to Yahweh as involving verbal communication. In Deuteronomy the people approach to receive God's commandments and ordinances; in the other passages God summons groups to assemble to hear the charges against them, to argue their case, or to receive their punishment. In Isa. 41:5 the "coastlands" and the "ends of the earth" are to present themselves for judgment. V. 1 is a summons to dialogue with God. In Isa. 48 "hear" (vv. 1,12,14,16) is reinforced by other imperatives in vv. 14 ("assemble" [*qbṣ* niphal]) and 16 ("draw near" [*qrb*]). The conjunction of *qrb* and *qbṣ* demonstrates the close relationship between the two words. In Isa. 34:1 the assembly of all the nations emphasizes God's universal sovereignty and the importance of the prophet's message.

In Ps. 119:169 the psalmist's cry — representing the psalmist's own personal petition — comes before *(lip̲nê)* Yahweh to plead for help. The context has legal overtones: the petitioner delights in the *tôrâ* and expects a favorable decision (vv. 174-75; cf. vv. 163-64). In Mal. 3:5 God draws near to bear witness against the wicked.

(10) In some texts the motivation is not defined, especially when a temporal expression is the subject of *qrb.* In five instances the subject is "days" (= "time") — three times with reference to an approaching hour of death (Gen. 47:29; Dt. 31:14; 1 K. 2:1), once with reference to approaching days of mourning (Gen. 27:41), and once with reference to the time when all visions will be fulfilled (Ezk. 12:23). Dt. 15:9 has to do with the seventh year, when debts are remitted. Lam. 4:18 speaks of the calamitous end approaching the inhabitants of Jerusalem.

Three texts use *qrb* with a personal subject without specifying a motivation. In Dt. 2:19 the Israelites "approach the frontier of the Ammonites" (a simple statement of fact). In Josh. 3:4 the Israelites are commanded to keep a certain distance *(rḥq)* from the ark and not to come near it. In Job 33:22 the life of a sick person draws near the Pit (*šaḥat̲;* cf. Ps. 16:10).

According to Isa. 5:19, the wicked say sarcastically, "Let God's plan come near," i.e., come to pass quickly, thus calling into question God's ability to carry it out. Ps. 32:9 is difficult. It speaks of a horse and mule that have to be controlled by bit and bridle; in the clause that follows *(bal qᵉrōb̲ ʾēleyk̲ā),* it is not clear who is approaching whom. Possibly the animals are the subject, but the suffix *-k̲ā* has no referent.

b. *Other Meanings.* In 22 passages *qrb* has a meaning other than "come near."

(1) In Jgs. 19:13 the traveling Levite wants to "reach" Gibeah or Ramah for safety. Here *qrb* is constructed with *bᵉ,* whereas the meaning "come near" normally requires *ʾel.* Cf. Ps. 91:10: "May no scourge reach your tent."

(2) In Ezk. 37:7 the dry bones come together to form a skeleton. In 1 K. 20:29 the armies of Israel and Aram confront each other at a distance; on the seventh day "battle was joined" *(wattiqrab̲ hammilḥāmâ),* an idiomatic expression indicating that the two sides clashed violently. Ex. 14:20 is difficult, but probably means that the distance between the two camps did not decrease in the course of the night. In Ex. 36:2 *qrb* can be translated "set to work."

(3) The qal of *qrb* can mean "have access," usually in cultic contexts. One text (Ezk. 42:14) deals with the passage of priests from sacred precincts to secular. According to Nu. 18:3, the Levites have no access to the sacred utensils and the altar. Here access is the right to minister.[21] Levites must transport the holy objects (Nu. 4:4ff., esp. v. 19: *ngš*) only when the objects are covered. In similar fashion Ezk. 44:13-16 contrasts the exclusion of the Levites (v. 13, *ngš*) with the priestly right of access (*qrb*, vv. 15-16). The semantic equivalence of *ngš* and *qrb* is noteworthy.[22] V. 13 forbids access to God (*'ēlay*), but this prohibition probably refers to entering the sanctuary and touching the holy utensils in order to minister to God (v. 16). Ezk. 42:14 requires the priests to don lay clothing before entering (*qrb*) the secular sphere.

(4) Closely related is the meaning "be ritually qualified." According to Ex. 12:48, an alien (*gēr*) who wishes to take part in celebrating (*yiqrab̲ la'ᵃśôt̲*) Passover must accept circumcision. Thus the meaning of *qrb* includes the sense of authorization to perform an action (here the Passover ritual; cf. Ezk. 45:4). According to Lev. 21:17-18, an offspring of Aaron who has a blemish is disqualified (prohibitive *qrb*) from offering (*qrb* hiphil; cf. the qal in v. 18) "the food of his God." He may eat the most holy food (v. 22), but may not perform the sacrificial ritual.

(5) Used in a negative sense, *qrb* refers to overstepping cultic boundaries, i.e., violation of cultic regulations. Lev. 22:3 states the principle: any priest who involves himself with holy things while ritually unclean is cut off (*krt* niphal) from God's presence. The following verses outline various situations to which this principle applies; they are all connected with the eating of holy food. According to Nu. 18:22, "the Israelites shall no longer approach the tent of meeting, or else they will incur guilt and die." But this prohibition does not preclude all physical proximity, for sacrifice is offered in the court of the sanctuary (e.g., Lev. 1:3). The meaning of *qrb* is illuminated by the broader context: the rebellion of Korah. The reason Korah and his followers died was not that they had entered a forbidden area: they had remained at the entrance of the tent of meeting (Nu. 16:18). Their sin was not their approach but their attempt to appropriate the priestly function of offering incense (cf. Nu. 17:5[16:40]: "no outsider [*zār*] shall presume [*qrb*] to offer incense before Yahweh").[23] According to Nu. 18:4, no unauthorized outsider (*zār*) was allowed to "approach" the priest; i.e., an outsider could not assist — simple contact between laity and priests was certainly not prohibited. Lev. 16:1 appears to suggest that the reason the two sons of Aaron died was that they had drawn near before Yahweh (*bᵉqorb̲āt̲ām lip̲nê yhwh*); 10:1 shows, however, that they had offered incense without authorization.

(6) Another reason for drawing near to God is to make inquiry (1 S. 14:36; cf. v. 37 [*šā'al*]; also Jgs. 18:5; 20:18).

(7) Isa. 65:5 uses an idiomatic expression. The idol worshipers, who sit in tombs and eat swine's flesh, say: "Stay where you are (*qᵉrab̲ 'ēlêk̲ā*), do not come near me

21. Sifre Nu. 116; Sifre Zuta on Nu. 18:3.
22. Milgrom, 34-35.
23. Milgrom, 18-19.

('al-tiggaš-bî), or else I will make you holy [reading *qiddaštîk̲ā*]." The person in question means that he is in a state of holiness and therefore must avoid contact with the profane.

c. *Niphal.* The verb *qrb* appears twice in the niphal, both times with reflexive meaning. In Josh. 7:14 the niphal refers to assembly for legal proceedings; when the proceedings have begun, the qal can be used.[24] Ex. 22:7(8) requires an individual to come before *('el)* God; the preposition implies that the text is referring to the place where legal proceedings are held, not to the divine presence (cf. Nu. 27:5: *lip̲nê*).

d. *Piel.* The piel is often used as the causative of the qal.[25] But it can also simply mean "approach," with emphasis on the nature of the action: "like an oven" (Hos. 7:6), "like a prince," i.e., "proudly" (Job 31:37).[26] Isa. 46:13 says that God has brought deliverance near; it is no longer far off *(rḥq)* and will not tarry *('ḥr).* According to Ezk. 9:1, God summons agents (NRSV "executioners") to destroy the people. In Isa. 41:21 the listeners are bidden to bring their case before God (a meaning for which other texts used the hiphil; cf. *ngš* hiphil as a parallel). In Ezk. 37:16-17 the prophet is commanded to join two sticks of wood. According to Ps. 65:5(4), God gives humans access to the temple, where they can enjoy his gifts. If one assumes that "temple" is not to be understood in a broader sense, this statement cannot be literally true: only priests had this privilege. In Ezk. 36:8, finally, *qērᵉb̲û lāb̲ô'* clearly means "they are on the point of coming";[27] the reference is to the imminent restoration of the Israelites.

e. *Hiphil.* There are 177 occurrences of the hiphil, used with causative meaning: "bring near, offer." It is the normal term for cultic offering to Yahweh. The cultic usage predominates; noncultic offering exhibits wide variation.

(1) With an impersonal object, *hiqrîb̲* can mean "bring." Jael brings (or hands) Sisera a bowl of curds (Jgs. 5:25). Ahaz "removes" the bronze altar (2 K. 16:14). It is actually not brought nearer but set up at a distance; the text has sarcastic overtones. Ahaz draws near (*qrb* qal) to the new altar but removes the true altar. Legal matters are brought (Dt. 1:17; Nu. 27:5), i.e., they are presented to a judge for a final decision.

The hiphil in the sense of "bring" can also have a personal object. People may be taken and brought to judgment (Nu. 15:33; Josh. 8:23); a man brings a Midianite woman before Moses and the people (Nu. 25:6); a leader brings or assembles a group for a particular purpose (4 times in Josh. 7:16-18; cf. 1 S. 10:20).

In Ezk. 22:4 "the days" have been brought near, i.e., through its sin Jerusalem has brought the time of judgment.

In Jer. 30:21 God promises to "grant access" (*qrb* hiphil) to the coming ideal ruler, so that he can approach God (*ngš* niphal) — an idea that has been borrowed from the cultic sphere and spiritualized in a new context.

(2) The hiphil can also denote the offering of gifts or tribute to a ruler (Ps. 72:10;

---

24. See above.
25. *HP,* 75-76.
26. But cf. K. Budde, *Hiob. HKAT* II/1 (^{2}1913), 195: "Like a prince I will admit him."
27. See the discussion of Akkadian usage above.

Jgs. 3:17). Mal. 1:8 uses an analogy between noncultic and cultic offerings: is it not wrong for the people to offer (*ngš* hiphil) an imperfect animal as a sacrifice? Were it offered (*qrb* hiphil) to the governor as a gift, he would not accept it.

(3) Isa. 5:8 excoriates the wealthy who greedily go after real estate: "Woe to you who join (*ngʿ* hiphil) house to house and add (*qrb* hiphil) field to field." The terminology reflects the consolidation of real estate parcels under the same owner.

(4) In rare instances the hiphil is used intransitively. In Ex. 14:10 we read that Pharaoh drew near — which means here that his army drew near. In Gen. 12:11 *kaʾᵃšer hiqrîḇ lāḇôʾ miṣrāyᵉmâ* can be translated as: "When he was about to enter Egypt." Isa. 26:17 speaks similarly of "a pregnant woman who is about to bear her child."

f. *Hiphil in Cultic Contexts.* The hiphil occurs 156 times in cultic contexts. The object may be a sacrifice or a person who is authorized to perform a sacred function.

(1) The hiphil of *qrb* is the ordinary term for presenting an offering; it does not, however, encompass the sacrificial ritual proper.[28] When Yahweh is the recipient, *hiqrîḇ* is constructed with *lᵉ* (Lev. 7:38); otherwise *ʾel* is used (Lev. 1:15: "bring to the altar"; Lev. 1:3: "bring to the entrance of the tent") (cf. noncultic bringing with *lᵉ* in Jgs. 3:17).

The approach of the priest to the altar (qal, Lev. 9:7-8) and his presentation of the offering (hiphil, v. 15) are two aspects of the same procedure (cf. the hiphil in v. 2). The former marks the beginning of the act, the latter the presentation of the offering to Yahweh.

Clearly *hiqrîḇ* refers to an action involving movement: an object or an animal is set in motion, especially when the prep. *ʾel* specifies a destination such as the altar (Lev. 1:15; Nu. 5:25) or the entrance to the tent (Lev. 1:3). Live animals can be led; objects such as fat, blood, and grain must be transported. In Lev. 17:4 *hiqrîḇ* refers to more than this movement: whoever slaughters an animal "and does not bring (*bôʾ* hiphil) it to the entrance of the tent of meeting, to present it *(hiqrîḇ)* as an offering to Yahweh before his dwelling place. . . ." The bringing of the animal is described by *hēḇîʾ*; the intention (sacrifice) finds expression in *hiqrîḇ*. In Lev. 1:3 *hiqrîḇ* comprehends both aspects.

Both priests and laypersons can "present" offerings. Since, however, laypersons do not have access to the altar, they can only slaughter an animal (Lev. 1:5,11; exception: v. 15); they cannot perform the rest of the sacrificial ritual.

The objects presented in the cult include such general sacrificial terms as → קרבן *qorbān, ʾiššeh, leḥem ʾᵉlōhîm, rēaḥ nîḥōaḥ,* → תרומה *tᵉrûmâ* (here the offering belongs to the priest [Lev. 7:14; cf. Nu. 5:9]); sacrificial animals such as bulls, calves, sheep, goats, and birds; portions of animals (fat and blood); grain and wine (Ex. 29:2; Nu. 15:10); incense (Nu. 16:35; Lev. 10:1; Nu. 16:17; 17:3-4[16:38-39]); special types of sacrifice such as *ʿōlâ, šᵉlāmîm,* and *ḥaṭṭāʾṯ;* and offerings for the support of the sanctuary (Nu. 7). The booty taken from the Midianites is also presented, to make atonement and as a memorial (31:50,54). Finally, the Levites are presented before Yahweh (8:9-11).

---

28. → עשׂה *ʿāśâ.*

(2) In Lev. 9:9 *wayyaqrîḇû* describes an action performed by the sons of Aaron to assist their father in making a sacrificial offering. They do not offer the blood themselves but present it to their father. The difference between offering and presenting is also illustrated by the use of *mṣ'* hiphil in vv. 12-13,18.

Since the scapegoat ritual is not a sacrifice but an act of elimination, in Lev. 16:20 *wᵉhiqrîḇ* must be understood in the sense of "fetch." We may note that in v. 9 the goat for Yahweh is offered (*qrb* hiphil), whereas the scapegoat is only made to stand (*'md* hophal) before Yahweh (cf. Nu. 5:16).

Priests can be the object of *hiqrîḇ* when they are instructed to come forward to be consecrated. Although this consecration establishes a special relationship with Yahweh (Ex. 28:3-4), the fact that the priests are brought to Moses rather than Yahweh (Ex. 28:1; 29:4-5; cf. Ex. 29:8 and Lev. 8:24 with a different purpose) shows that they are not being "presented." Aaron and his sons must be brought to Moses to be clothed in the priestly garments. Only the Levites are presented before Yahweh when they are consecrated,[29] but not the priests since they have their holiness directly from Yahweh (Ex. 29:44).

According to Nu. 5:16, a priest is to "bring" a woman suspected of adultery and set her before Yahweh. This act transposes her to the role of the accused before the divine judge.

(3) In addition, *hiqrîḇ* can be used in the sense of "bring into a close relationship," qualifying a person to perform a certain ministry. In Nu. 3:6 and 18:2 this relationship is established between the Levites and Aaron; Nu. 16:9-10 speaks of the close relationship between the Levites and God. Nu. 16:5 describes a test to determine who stands in the right relationship with Yahweh and is allowed to minister in the cult; obviously it turns out to be Aaron who is "holy" and is allowed to "approach" Yahweh.

3. *Participle.* The ptcp. or verbal adj. *qārēḇ* occurs 12 times (6 in Numbers); it exhibits the same nuances as the qal of the verb.

a. *Drawing Near.* The purpose can be to join battle (Dt. 20:3; 1 S. 17:41), to deliver a message (2 S. 18:25), or to perform cultic service (Ezk. 45:4; Nu. 17:28[13]; to offer sacrifice).

b. *Having Access.* "All having access to Solomon's table" (1 K. 5:7(4:27); "the descendants of Zadok, who alone . . . have access to Yahweh to minister to him" (Ezk. 40:46; cf. 44:13: *ngš* qal).

c. *Qualified.* The priests are qualified to minister to Yahweh (Ezk. 45:4).

d. *Draw Near Without Permission.* In Nu. 1:51; 3:10,38; 18:7, we find the formula *hazzār haqqārēḇ yûmāṯ*, "any outsider who comes near [to minister] shall be put to death." A *zār* is not qualified to officiate in the cult; an attempt on the part of such a person to minister is an offense.[30] In Nu. 17:28(13) the Israelites complain that everyone who comes too close to the dwelling place of Yahweh (*kol haqqārēḇ haqqārēḇ 'el-miškan yhwh*) will die. The Israelites are afraid to approach the sanctuary even to fulfill

29. See above.
30. Milgrom, 17.

their legitimate cultic obligations (cf. Lev. 9:5, where the qal refers to the approach of the lay congregation). The answer is given in Nu. 18:1-24, esp. vv. 1-7,21-23: the priests and Levites shall bear the responsibility for illicit atttempts to officiate, whether committed by laity or priests (vv. 1,3,23).

4. *qārôḇ*. The adj. *qārôḇ,* "near," occurs 77 times; it can refer to space, personal relationships, and time.

a. *Space.* (1) Places can be near each other. Naboth's vineyard is near Ahab's house (1 K. 21:2); the way through the land of the Philistines is nearer, i.e., shorter (Ex. 13:17). "A land far off or near" (1 K. 8:46 par. 2 Ch. 6:36) is any land at all (cf. Jer. 48:24: towns). If a city is near, one can flee to it (Gen. 19:20). The town nearest the place where a body is found is held responsible for the murder (Dt. 21:3).

(2) Persons can be near to or far from each other spatially (Ezk. 22:5; Est. 9:20; Dnl. 9:7 in merism; location undefined: Jer. 25:26; Ezk. 6:12). If persons are "near" each other, this can mean that they live close to each other (Gen. 45:10; Ex. 12:4; Dt. 13:8[7]; Josh. 9:16; Prov. 27:10). In anthropomorphic language, persons can be near to or far from God (Isa. 33:13; 57:19).

(3) God is near those who call upon him (Dt. 4:7; Ps. 34:19[18]; 119:151 [wicked persecutors draw near — v. 150 — but God is also near]; 145:18 [cf. v. 19]; Isa. 50:8 ["my vindicator is near"]). God's nearness is viewed anthropomorphically in spatial categories. In Isa. 55:6 the prophet calls on his hearers to seek God "while he is near." V. 7 shows that these words are a call to repentance, necessitated by the human tendency to procrastinate. Jeremiah reproves his hypocritical compatriots: God is near in their mouths but far from their hearts (Jer. 12:2). In Jer. 23:23 God asks rhetorically: "Am I a God near by, and not a God far off?" V. 24 gives the answer: God is not restricted spatially, but sees human beings wherever they are.[31]

(4) God's name is near (i.e., accessible) to those who tell God's wondrous deeds (Ps. 75:2[1]). According to Dt. 30:14, God's word is near; i.e., anyone can learn the commandments and keep them (cf. the opposite in Ps. 119:150). The words of a prayer can be near (i.e., perceptible) to God (1 K. 8:59), so that God can answer them. When trouble is near, the psalmist prays that God will not be far (Ps. 22:12[11]).

b. *Personal Relationships.* (1) The adj. *qārôḇ* can denote a close kinship (usually with *'el;* Ruth 2:20 and Neh. 13:4 with *lᵉ;* Ruth 3:12 with comparative *min*). The superlative appears in Lev. 25:25, where the *gō'ēl haqqārôḇ* ("nearest redeemer"; NRSV "next of kin") is to redeem the piece of property, and in Nu. 27:11, where the next of kin claims the inheritance. Lev. 21:2-3 defines the "nearest kin" whose corpses a priest may touch.

Such nearness can extend beyond the immediate family circle. In Dt. 22:2 *'āḥ lō' qārôḇ* refers not to an actual brother who does not live nearby but to a fellow Israelite with whom one does not have close ties. According to 2 S. 19:43, the people of Judah say that the king is nearer to them than to the Israelites — naturally so, since David was from Judah. In 1 Ch. 12:41(40) *haqqᵉrôḇîm ᵃlêhem* refers to fellow Israelites (par.

31. Lemke.

"brothers"). In Est. 1:14 *qārôḇ* stands collectively for the inner circle of the king's counselors.

The series *'āḥ, rēa', qārôḇ* (Ex. 32:27) could refer to relatives, friends, and neighbors, respectively; probably, however, we have here three words for "fellow Israelite." In other instances it is not clear whether a relative or a neighbor is meant: Ps. 15:3 ("who do no evil to their *rēa'* nor take up a reproach against their *qārôḇ*"); 38:12(11) (friends [*'ōhēḇ*], companions [*rēa'*], and kinfolk/neighbors [*qārôḇ*] spurn the afflicted psalmist); Job 19:14 (*qᵉrôḇîm* and acquaintances [*mᵉyuddā'îm*] have failed Job).

(2) Ps. 148:14 calls the people of Israel *'am qᵉrôḇô,* "the people who are close to him" (cf. *rḥq* in Ps. 73:27). Ezk. 42:13 speaks of the priests "who are close to Yahweh," i.e., enjoy a special relationship with him and are allowed to approach him (cf. 43:19).

After the death of Aaron's sons, Moses recounts to Aaron the words of Yahweh: "By those who are near me *(qᵉrôḇay)* I will be held holy [or: I show myself holy], and before all the people I will be glorified" (Lev. 10:3). Here the distinction is between priests and laity. The priests, who enjoy a special relationship with Yahweh, must be particularly careful to respect his holiness.

c. *Time.* (1) When a time is *qārôḇ,* it is imminent: "the day of their [the wicked's] calamity" (Dt. 32:35), the day of Judah's destruction (Ezk. 7:7), the day of Yahweh (Joel 2:1). The prophets use the expression *qārôḇ yôm yhwh* to express the imminence of the day of Yahweh[32] (Isa. 13:6; Ezk. 30:3 [*yôm lᵉyhwh*]; Joel 1:15 [cf. Isa. 13:6]; 4:14[3:14]; Ob. 15; Zeph. 1:7,14). The last passage is particularly dramatic: "The great day of Yahweh is near, near and hastening fast." Heintz notes the similarity of *qārôḇ yôm yhwh* and other expressions using *qārôḇ* that express the imminence of a time or event to an Akkadian expression in the Mari texts that refers to the death of an enemy.[33]

(2) Similar examples depict the calamity of Moab (Jer. 48:16), the salvation of God (Isa. 56:1; Ps. 85:10[9]), the "righteousness" (NRSV "deliverance") of God (Isa. 51:5), the light of dawn (Job 17:12), and ruin in general (Prov. 10:14). In Job 20:5 *miqqārôḇ* parallels *'ᵃḏê-rāga'* ("for a moment"), describing the exulting of the wicked, which lasts only briefly.

(3) Alone or with a preposition, *qārôb* can be used adverbially in the sense of "soon" (Nu. 24:17; Ezk. 7:8; 11:3). The expression *miqqārôḇ* means "recently" (Dt. 32:17).

(4) Ezk. 23:5 calls the Assyrians *qᵉrôḇîm* (cf. v. 12), which is probably cognate with Aram. *qᵉrāḇ,* "war," and thus means "warriors." Also possible is a connection with Akk. *qurubtu/qurbūtu,* "bodyguard, guardsman."[34]

5. *Infinitive.* The inf. *qirḇâ* occurs only twice, both times in the phrase *qirḇat 'ᵉlōhîm,* "nearness of God." In this nearness the psalmist experiences God as a refuge (Ps. 73:28 — or is the reference to nearness in the temple?[35]); Isa. 58:2 has to do with God's righteous judgment.

32. → יוֹם *yôm.*
33. Heintz, 534ff.
34. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 472; *AHw,* II, 929. *s.v. qurbu.*
35. H. Ringgren, *Die Psalmen* (Stuttgart, 1971), 36, 73.

6. *Nouns.* The noun *qᵉrāḇ,* "war, battle," is usually considered an Aramaic loanword.[36] The appearance of the word in the early text 2 S. 17:11 might argue against this assumption, but here LXX, Syr., and Vg. read *bᵉqirbām.* The Ephraimites are described as engaging in battle in Ps. 78:9, as are the nations in Zec. 14:3. Ps. 68:31(30) speaks of "the peoples who delight in war." The *yôm qᵉrāḇ,* "day of battle," appears in Ps. 78:9; Job 38:23; Zec. 14:3. According to Eccl. 9:18, wisdom is better than weapons of war *(kᵉlê qᵉrāḇ).* God is a warrior (Zec. 14:3), who stores up snow and hail for the day of battle (Job 38:22-23) and teaches the psalmist to fight (Ps. 144:1) or protects the psalmist in battle (55:19[18]). The heart of an individual is "set on war" (55:22[21]).

7. *Aramaic.* The verb *qᵉrēḇ* occurs 9 times in Biblical Aramaic: 5 in the peal, once in the pael, and 3 times in the haphel. The texts using the peal all speak of approaching persons to speak with them (Dnl. 3:8,26; 6:13,21[12,20]; 7:16). The pael form in Ezr. 7:17 is a term for offering sacrifice. The haphel has the same meaning in Ezr. 6:10,17. Dnl. 7:13 describes the bringing of the "son of man" before the Ancient One. A formal presentation appears to be intended.

The noun *qᵉrāḇ* appears only in Dnl. 7:21, where it refers to the war of the horn against the holy ones.

8. *Synonyms and Antonyms.* Among synonyms, the most important are *ngš* and *bô'.* When *ngš* and *qrb* are used together, it is hard to observe any semantic distinction (qal: Lev. 21:21; Jgs. 20:23-24; Isa. 41:1; 65:5; Jer. 30:21; Ezk. 44:13; hiphil: Isa. 41:21; Mal. 1:8). Nu. 8:19 uses *ngš* with the same meaning as *qrb* in Lev. 9:5. Like *qrb, ngš* describes the approach of a priest to the altar (Lev. 21:23); its hiphil denotes the presentation of an offering (Lev. 2:8). Falk has pointed out the use of both verbs in forensic contexts.[37] Both verbs can also be used for oracular inquisition *(ngš:* 1 S. 14:18; 23:9; Am. 6:3;[38] *qrb:* 1 S. 14:36[39]). We do not find *ngš,* however, in a temporal sense.[40]

The verbs *bô'* and *qrb* can stand in synonymous parallelism (Ps. 119:169-70; Lam. 4:18), in the hiphil *(hiqrîḇ* par. *hēḇî')* as well as in the qal. On the other hand, Ex. 40:32 and Ezk. 44:16 show that *bô' 'el* refers simply to entering the sanctuary, whereas *qrb* and *ngš* with *'el* stand for approaching the altar. Both *bô'* and *qrb* may have temporal connotations.[41]

In Ezk. 20:28 *nāṯan* denotes the presentation of offerings, but in this case in a non-Yahwistic cult. It can also denote the handing of something to a priest (Lev. 15:14; 27:9) without suggesting the presentation of an offering.

The opposite of *qrb* is *rḥq.* Except in Isa. 46:13 (temporal), the contrast is always spatial (Prov. 5:8; Isa. 54:14; Ps. 119:150). The pair *qārôḇ* — *rāḥôq* functions as a

36. Kühlewein, 674.
37. Falk, 353-54.
38. S. Iwry, *JAOS* 81 (1961) 32-34.
39. See II.2.b.(6) above.
40. Kühlewein, 675.
41. See above.

merism.[42] We do not find *rḥq* in cultic contexts.[43] The contrast between *zār,* "outsider," and *qārēḇ* is discussed above.[44]

III. Dead Sea Scrolls. In the Dead Sea Scrolls *qrb* often has hostile connotations, especially in the War Scroll (1QM 1:10; 8:7; 10:2-3 [cf. Dt. 20:2-9]; also 1QH 14:14, etc.; cf. the noun *qᵉrāḇ* in1QM 1:9; 13:14). A sexual sense occurs in CD 5:9, quoting Lev. 18:13; cultic presentation appears in 1QS 8:9 (aroma of sacrifice).

Especially interesting is the use of *qrb* in connection with the entrance of new members into the community. After preparatory examination and instruction, the novice comes before the community. "When he enters to come before the many, they shall all be questioned concerning his case. Depending on the outcome of the lot in the council of the many, he shall draw near or depart" (1QS 6:15-16). The question is whether he is qualified. After a year he is examined again, "and if the lot favors him, so that he may draw near to the council of the community in the opinion of the priests and a majority of the members," he is advanced in rank (6:18-19). The final examination comes at the end of another year, and he is inducted (*qrb* piel) into the community (6:22). Here *qrb* means not just "enter" but "be admitted as qualified." Readmission after temporary exclusion is dealt with in 1QS 7:21 and 8:18; cf. also 9:16.

Liebermann has shown that rabbinic literature uses the piel of *qrb* along with *qbl* as a term for admission to a Pharisaic *ḥᵃḇûrâ.*[45] Here we find the same notion of being qualified.

IV. LXX. The LXX uses several Greek words to reproduce the various forms of *qrb.* Most common are the following: for the qal, *prosérchesthai* (36 times), *engízein* (30 times, including Ezk. 36:8 following the reading of Pap. 967[46]), and *proságein* (13 times); for the hiphil, *prosphérein* (91 times) and *proságein* (72 times); for *qārēḇ, prosporeúesthai* and *engízein* (4 times each); for *qᵉrāḇ, pólemos* (7 times); for *qārôḇ, engýs* with its derivatives (45 times) and *engízein* (28 times). The Aramaic peal is translated with *prosérchesthai* (7 times), the haphel with *prosphérein.*

The variety of translations suggests that the translators recognized the different semantic nuances. It is not by accident, for example, that *prosphérein* often translates the hiphil, since the Greek verb can mean both "present = offer" and "bring."

Other translations are explained by the requirements of particular texts. For example, the qal is represented by *háptesthai,* "touch," in Gen. 20:4 (sexual connotations; cf. *ngʿ* in v. 6) and Ezk. 42:14 (access; perhaps from the use of *háptōntai* for *hinnîaḥ* earlier in the same verse); by *eisérchesthai,* "enter" (sexually), in Lev. 18:14,19; by *histánai,* "stand," in Josh. 17:4 (for communication, possibly after the example of *qrb* + *ʿmd* in Nu. 27:1-2); and by *symmignýnai,* "mix," in Ex. 14:20.

42. See II.4.a.(2) above.
43. Lemke, 547.
44. See II.3.d.
45. S. Liebermann, *JBL* 71 (1952) 199-200, 202.
46. Marcos, 358-59.

For the niphal in Josh. 7:14, we find *synágein,* "assemble." For the piel, we find *anakaíein,* "ignite" (Hos. 7:6, under the influence of "oven"), *proslambánein,* "accept" (Ps. 65:5[4]), and *synáptein,* "fit together" (Ezk. 37:17). For the hiphil, we find *lambánein,* "take" (Nu. 3:6, possibly influenced by *lqḥ* in Nu. 8:6), and *synágein,* "assemble" (Jer. 30[37]:21 — transferred to the people). The verbal adjective is translated by *háptesthai,* "grasp, touch," in Nu. 3:10,38; 17:28[13], the inf. *qirḇâ* by *proskollán,* "adhere to," in Ps. 73:28. In Dnl. 7:13 the Aramaic haphel is translated with *pareínai,* "be present," which appears to render both *mᵉṭâ* and *qrb.*

Gane/Milgrom

קֶרֶב *qereḇ*

I. Etymology. II. Distribution. III. Usage: 1. Entrails; 2. Inside; 3. Seat of Thoughts and Emotions; 4. Interior; 5. Midst; 6. God's Presence; 7. Be Cut Off From. IV. Dead Sea Scrolls, Sirach, and LXX.

I. Etymology. The word *qereḇ* is a primary noun,[1] distinct from the verbal root → קרב *qrb.*[2] It has cognates in Akkadian, Ugaritic, and Egyptian,[3] which, like the Hebrew word, mean both "intestines" and "interior," as well as meaning "within, in the midst of" when compounded with the preposition meaning "in."

In Akkadian, *qerbū* (pl.) means "entrails," e.g., of animals. Used absolutely or with the prep. *ana,* "to," *ina,* "in," or *ištu,* "from," *qerbu*[4] stands for the interior of a land, a region, a city, or a building, as well as of a time period: *ina qereb kirâti,* "in the midst of the garden"; *ana qereb bābili,* "into Babylon"; *ina qereb mātika,* "in your land," *ina qereb tamḫāri,* "in the midst of the battle"; *ina qereb mušīti,* "around midnight." It can also refer to a person: *itti qerbišu idabbub,* "he speaks with his inner parts," i.e., "he debates with himself." Finally, it can refer to objects: *ša . . . asûm qerebšu la ilammadu,* "which a physician cannot diagnose"; *amassu qerebša ul illammad,* "the meaning of his word cannot be understood."

In Ugaritic, *qrb* II[5] means "middle," and may refer to the female genitalia.[6] As a preposition *bqrb* has the meaning "in the midst of," like Heb. *bᵉqereḇ* and Akk. *ina*

---

qereḇ. P. Lacau, *Les noms des parties du corps en Égyptien et en Sémitique* (Paris, 1970), esp. §195; H. W. Wolff, *Anthropology of the OT* (Eng. trans. Philadelphia, 1974), 63-64.

1. *BLe,* §61q′.
2. J. Kühlewein, *THAT,* II, 674.
3. *KBL*³, 1059.
4. *AHw,* II, 914-15; *CAD,* Q, 216-27.
5. *UT,* no. 2269; *WUS,* no. 2449.
6. See *KTU,* 1.11, 1, par. *ušk,* "testicles" (*UT,* no. 397).

qereb, and is often interpreted as a "ballast variant" of *b:*[7] *wykn bnh bbt šrš bqrb hklh,* "and his son shall be in the house, a scion in the midst of his palace."[8]

The prep. *bqrb,* "within," appears twice in the Moabite Mesha inscription with *qr,* "city," as its object.[9]

The Egyptian word *ḳ3b* means "intestines, bowels," in medical texts, but it is also used metaphorically for the interior of the land. The prepositional phrase *mḳ3b* stands for the "midst" of a space or a group of people.[10]

II. Distribution. There are 227 occurrences of *qereḇ* in the OT as a whole; but it is rare in the late books, and does not appear at all in Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Haggai, and Malachi. Its absence, however, does not in itself suggest that a book is late, since *qereḇ* also appears in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Sirach. There are 8 occurrences in Genesis, 16 in Exodus, 24 in Leviticus, 10 in Numbers, then 41 in Deuteronomy, 35 in the Dtr History, 17 in Isaiah, 10 in Jeremiah, 4 in Ezekiel, 27 in the Book of the Twelve, 27 in Psalms, 3 in Proverbs, 1 in Job, and 4 in Lamentations. It appears 155 times with the prep. *b*ᵉ and 43 times with *min.* The word appears in a variety of idioms, especially with verbs of motion.[11]

III. Usage.

1. *Entrails.* The basic meaning "entrails" appears especially in Priestly texts dealing with sacrificial rituals. In a burnt offering the entrails of the sacrificial animal must be washed before being laid on the altar (Lev. 1:9).[12] In a *š*ᵉ*lāmîm* offering the fat covering the entrails is among the portions of the sacrificial animal that cannot be eaten but must be burned on the altar (Lev. 3:3). The Passover lamb is roasted whole, with head, legs, and inner organs (Ex. 12:9). Apart from these P texts, *qereḇ* has its literal basic meaning only in Gen. 41:21.

2. *Inside.* From the meaning "entrails" it is only a short step to the meaning "interior" in general, which is the most common OT usage. The OT was clearly conscious of the close relationship between the two meanings, as Gen. 25:22 shows: Rebekah's twins struggle "within her" or "in her womb." In 41:21 *qereḇ* has a similar meaning: in both cases the reference is to the body cavity of a person or animal. In Job 20:14, too, *qereḇ* is ambivalent: "In his intestines *(b*ᵉ*mēʿāyw)* his food is transformed, in his body [*b*ᵉ*qirbô;* LXX *gastḗr*] it turns to the venom of asps."

In 1 K. 17:22 the meaning of *qereḇ* may also be physical, although not limited to the human body: "Life returned to the interior of the child, and he revived." Possibly *qereḇ* stands here for the lungs, since the child had ceased to breathe (v. 17). The simplest ex-

---

7. *UT,* §13.116; M. Dahood, *RSP,* I, 137-38.
8. *KTU,* 1.17, I, 25.
9. *KAI,* 181.23-24.
10. *WbÄS,* V, 970; A. Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar* (Oxford, ³1957), §178.
11. *HAL,* III, 1136.
12. → עולה *ʿôlâ.*

planation, however, is that the Israelites (like most people) believed that "life" was localized "inside" the human body, specifically within the abdomen or breast, since both move when a person breathes.

3. *Seat of Thoughts and Emotions.* Thoughts, emotions, dispositions, and other abstract qualities were thought of as being localized "inside" human beings. In this usage *b*ᵉ*qereḇ* is equivalent to *b*ᵉ*lēḇ*.[13] Sarah laughed "to herself" (Gen. 18:12); sinners are friendly toward their neighbors with their mouths, but "inwardly" they plan an ambush (Jer. 9:7[Eng. 8]); the heart is in anguish "in the breast" of the psalmist (Ps. 55:5[4]); Solomon had divine wisdom *b*ᵉ*qirbô* (1 K. 3:28). By metonymy, "what is within" can represent an individual (Ps. 103:1 par. *nep̱eš*).

4. *Interior.* In the general sense of "interior," *qereḇ* can refer to places, buildings, and geographical areas. In this usage it is synonymous with *b*ᵉ*ṯôḵ;* an example is Gen. 18:24, "in the city." Isa. 5:25 says that corpses lie like refuse in the streets; according to Ps. 101:7, no one who practices deceit shall remain in the psalmist's house (cf. Nu. 14:44 with *min*).

5. *Midst.* When a group of persons or objects is thought of metaphorically as occupying space, then *qereḇ* can mean the "midst" of such a group. An individual can be removed from *(miqqereḇ)* such a group or singled out for a specific task, e.g., a prophet from among his own people (Dt. 18:18). When the prep. *b*ᵉ is combined with *qereḇ,* the object or person is conceived as surrounded by or contained within a group (e.g., 1 S. 16:13). Both usages appear together in Josh. 7:13: "There are devoted things in your midst *(b*ᵉ*qirb*ᵉ*ḵā),* O Israel; you will be unable to stand before your enemies until you take away the devoted things from your midst *(miqqirb*ᵉ*ḵem).*" In Dt. 23:17(16) *b*ᵉ*qereḇ* modifies the prep. *ʿim,* "with": the fugitive is permitted to live not simply "with" Israel but within Israel, surrounded protectively.

With this semantic nuance, *b*ᵉ*qereḇ* is also used the describe the situation of Israel with respect to Canaan. The Canaanites that could not be driven out were allowed to keep their residence "within" Israel (Josh. 16:10; Jgs. 1:29-30); other texts speak of the Israelites living "amid" Canaanite territories (Jgs. 1:32-33; 3:5). The one people was contained within and surrounded by the other; this situation led to the warning about the inhabitants of the land, "lest when they dwell in the midst of you they become a snare to you" (Ex. 34:12).

When a member of a group committed a crime, that crime remained "amid" the group; the entire group was held responsible until exculpated. In the case of an unsolved murder, when the criminal could not be found and the guilt expunged, prayer was addressed to God: "Do not let the guilt of innocent blood remain in the midst of your people Israel"; i.e., may Yahweh not punish the whole community for the guilt of an individual (Dt. 21:8). In Deuteronomy the separation of a criminal from the

---

13. → לב *lēḇ*.

community is expressed by the formula *bi'artā hārā' miqqirbeḵā,* "purge the evil from your midst" (13:6[5]; 17:7; 19:19; 21:21; 22:21,24; 24:7; cf. 21:9). The eradication of the evil is a kind of operation on the body politic, keeping the evil from spreading (19:19).

Permitting the Canaanites to live "inside" Israel involved the twofold danger of a snare "within" (Ex. 34:12): all Israel could be punished for the sins of a few, and the evil could infect the whole community. The Dtn notion of Israel as a body that can be infected as a whole when one member is ill appears also in Isa. 4:4 and Jer. 6:6.

6. *God's Presence.* Vital for the health and safety of Israel as a body was not just freedom from disease within but above all God's presence within. This notion finds expression both as a petition and as a statement (Ex. 34:9; Dt. 7:21; cf. also Zeph. 3:17 and Ex. 17:7; Nu. 11:20; Dt. 23:15[14]; Jer. 14:9). God's presence in Israel depended on Israel's obedience; Israel's disobedience resulted in God's withdrawal or punishment (Ex. 33:3). When God is not in the midst of Israel, terrible troubles will come upon them (Dt. 31:17). The two perspectives are complementary: Israel's obedience effects God's presence, without which it cannot survive.

7. *Be Cut Off From.* Although in many cases Israel was responsible for banishing from its midst those who violated the law, there were many wrongs that God would requite personally by eradicating the transgressors: "I myself will cut them off from *(miqqereḇ)* the people" (Lev. 20:3; cf. 17:10). This idiom is characteristic of H (but see also Ex. 31:14); it appears in P (and occasionally in H) with the simple prep. *min* instead of *miqqereḇ.*[14]

IV. Dead Sea Scrolls, Sirach, and LXX. There are some 30 occurrences of *qereḇ* in the Dead Sea Scrolls, with the range of meanings found in the OT as outlined above. The Temple Scroll with its wealth of sacrificial rituals devotes attention to the *qereḇ* of sacrificial animals (11QT 15:6; 16:7,13; 20:5; 23:15; 33:14; 34:11). In the context of quotations from Deuteronomy, the *bi'artā* formula[15] is likewise incorporated in 11QT 54:18; 62:10; 64:6; 66:4; cf. 11QPs[a] 22:7; also CD 20:26 [with *kāraṯ*]). The notion of the "midst" of Israel is expressed in corresponding fashion (11QT 54:8 = Dt. 13:2; 55:1,3 = Dt. 13:12,14[11,13]; 55:15 = Dt. 17:2; 56:14 = Dt. 17:15; 61:11 = Dt. 19:20; 63:7 = Dt. 21:8). 11QT 2:5 takes up Ex. 34:12. The scrolls also refer to God's presence in the community (1QM 10:1; 13:8; 4QDibHam[a] 128:2; 4Q509 194:3). Interpreting Nah. 3:1-3, 4QpNah 2:5 declares that the sword will not depart from the midst of the community. In Mur 42:5 and 3Q15 7:8, *qereḇ* stands for a semantically vague geographical "proximity."

In Sirach *qereḇ* stands for the human interior, especially the locus of the emotions (Sir. 4:3; 34:20; 37:6; 40:30).

---

14. → כרת *kāraṯ.*
15. See III.5 above.

The LXX generally does not translate *qereḇ* explicitly. The combination *bᵉqereḇ* is usually rendered by *en (= bᵉ), diá, eis, entós, epí,* or *metá;* similarly, *miqqereḇ* is rendered mostly by simple *ek (= min)* or *apó.* For *qereḇ* without a preposition we often find *koilía, enkoilía,* or *endósthia,* "entrails, intestines" (esp. in the case of sacrificial animals; cf. also Gen. 41:21), *entós,* "within," or *kardía,* "heart." With a preposition, *qereḇ* can also be represented in Greek by *gastḗr,* "stomach"; *dianoía,* "thought"; *énkaton,* "interior"; *kardía;* or *mésos,* "midst," with an equivalent preposition.

Rattray/Milgrom

קָרְבָּן *qorbān;* קֻרְבָּן *qurbān*

I. 1. Etymology and Distribution; 2. LXX. II. 1. Lexical Field; 2. Meaning. III. Usage: 1. Generic Term; 2. Specification; 3. Sacrificial Offering; 4. Offering of the People; 5. Holiness Code; 6. Ezekiel; 7. Late Proto-Rabbinic Texts. IV. 1. Dead Sea Scrolls; 2. Late Judaism and Rabbinic Literature; 3. NT.

I. 1. *Etymology and Distribution.* The word *qorbān* is a verbal noun of the form *qiṭlān/quṭlān*[1] from the verbal root → קרב *qāraḇ.* As such — like *tᵉrûmâ*[2] and *tᵉnûp̱â,*[3] *neseḵ* and *qᵉṭōreṯ* — it was originally an action noun, "(the act of) offering"; soon, however, it came to refer concretely to the matter of the offering. To all appearances, this noun was not part of the ancient lexical stock of the language but gained a certain currency in the wake of OT Hebrew.

Other languages adopted it as a Hebrew loanword: Sam. *qārāban,*[4] Mand.

---

qorbān. S. Daniel, *Recherches sur le vocabulaire du culte dans la Septante. Études et commentaires* 61 (Paris, 1966), esp. 119-30; J. D. M. Derrett, "ΚΟΡΒΑΝ Ο ΕΣΤΙΝ ΔΩΡΟΝ," *NTS* 16 (1969/70) 364-68; J. de Fraine, "Offrande," *DBS,* VI, 683-88; G. B. Gray, *Sacrifice in the OT* (1925, repr. New York, 1971); H. Hommel, "Das Wort Karban und seine Verwandten," *Philologus* 98 (1955) 132-49; J. Kühlewein, "קרב *qrb* sich nähern," *THAT,* II, 674-81, esp. 677-78; B. A. Levine, *In the Presence of the Lord. SJLA* 5 (1974); J. Licht and J. Milgrom, "קרבנות/קרבן," *EMiqr,* VII (1976), 222-51; K. H. Rengstorf, "κορβᾶν, κορβανᾶς," *TDNT,* III, 860-66; M. Sznycer, "Trois fragments de papyri araméens d'Égypte d'époque perse," *Hommage à A. Dupont-Sommer* (Paris, 1971), 161-76; R. de Vaux, *AncIsr,* II, 415-23; *idem, Les sacrifices de l'AT. CahRB* 1 (1964); S. Zeitlin, "Korban," *JQR* 53 (1962) 160-63. For additional bibliog. see *ThWNT,* X/2, 1146-47.

→ מנחה *minḥâ.*

1. *BLe,* §61mθ.
2. → רום *rûm.*
3. → נוף *nwp.*
4. *LOT,* II, 582; A. Murtonen, *A Grammar of the Samaritan Dialects. StOr* 24 (1960) 185; *idem, Hebrew in Its West Semitic Setting. Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics* 13, 16 (Leiden, 1988-90), 1:381.

qurbana,[5] Syr. *qurbānā'*, "gift, tribute to the king,"[6] Christian Palestinian *qorbān*[7] (cf. the formulaic expression *mr' 'qbl qwrbnh*, "may the Lord accept the offering of . . .";[8] also the expression *l'št' qrbn*, "for the fire, an offering"[9]). The evidence for Jewish Aram. *qurbānā'* is uncertain;[10] the word *qrbn* in an Aramaic inscription of Barrakib from Sam'al could mean "offering," but it could equally well be a verbal form.[11] The Arad ostraca show that many jars bore logograms; the sign ק followed by a numeral may have designated the jar and its contents as *qōḏeš*[12] or possibly *qorbān (qōḏeš)* (cf. the logogram *q š*),[13] set aside as an offering for the temple.[14] The word *qrbn* in a fragmentary Aramaic letter may mean an appeasement offering given to a regional ruler by an official.[15] In South Semitic, *qrbn* is found in Old South Arabic[16] and Arabic;[17] Eth. *qʷĕrbān*,[18] like the same word in Amharic[19] and Tigre,[20] means "offering." One may also note Akk. *taqribtu*, "(act of) offering." Usage in Palestinian Aramaic and the Dead Sea Scrolls is discussed below.[21]

The noun *qorbān* (written as *qorḇān* in Ezk. 40:43[22]) occurs 80 times in the OT; all these occurrences (40 in Leviticus, 38 in Numbers, plus Ezk. 20:28; 40:43) associate the term with the language of the priestly cult, an observation already made with respect to the verb *qāraḇ*. The form *qurbān* appears only in Neh. 10:35(Eng. 34) and 13:31. Some have suggested that this variant reflects an intentional divergence from priestly usage or a dialectal difference.[23]

2. *LXX*. The LXX consistently translates *qorbān* with *dṓron*, which means "gift" in secular contexts; i.e., it understands *qorbān* as referring to the material of the offering. But it also suggests the aspect of an action in Lev. 7:15, where it translates the word with a verb *(dōreísthai)*. Elsewhere *dṓron* (usually in the plural) serves to translate other Hebrew sacrificial terms.

---

5. *MdD*, 409.
6. *LexSyr*, 692.
7. F. Schulthess, *Lexicon Syropalaestinum* (Berlin, 1903), 143.
8. Beyer, 405.
9. *CIJ*, II, 1407.
10. *DISO*, 265; also *WTM*, IV, 371-72; Beyer, 686.
11. *KAI*, 219.2.
12. Y. Aharoni, *BA* 21 (1968) 20.
13. Y. Aharoni, *Arad Inscriptions* (Jerusalem, 1975), 102-3, 117ff.
14. M. Weippert, *Palästina in vorhellenistischer Zeit. Handbuch der Archäologie, Vorderasien*, II/1 (1988), 586.
15. *RES*, 1810, 3; Sznycer, 170.
16. ContiRossini, 234; Biella, 466.
17. Wehr, 755.
18. *LexLingAeth*, 427.
19. W. Leslau, *Concise Amharic Dictionary* (Wiesbaden, 1976), 72.
20. *WbTigre*, 241-42.
21. See IV.1-2.
22. See *BLe*, §20k.
23. *KBL*[3], 1061.

In Lev. 3:14 the LXX improves the Hebrew text by disregarding *qorbān*. The use of the term in this verse is problematic, since it represents only one element of the *qorbān* in v. 12, a restriction that is semantically deviant.[24]

In Ezk. 20:28 the LXX accurately paraphrases the expression *ka'as qorbānām,* "their vexatious offering": *kaí éthysan ekeí toís theoís autṓn.* Here we see that for the LXX the word *qorbān* is associated exclusively with the sacrificial cult of Yahweh. In Ezk. 40:43 the LXX probably reflects a variant Hebrew text: instead of the *qorḇān* (!) on the tables inside the vestibule of the temple, it speaks of "shelters" *(stégas)* to protect the tables from rain.

In Neh. 10:35(34) the noun *qurbān* is translated accurately as *xylophoría,* in 13:30-31 as *xylophóros,* "wood offering."

Theodotion generally follows the LXX, while Aquila uses *dṓron* only to translate *minḥâ,* translating *qorbān* as *prosphorá;* Symmachus does the same.

II. 1. *Lexical Field.* Its association with the priestly language of the cult and its appearance in contexts dealing with offerings and sacrifices make *qorbān* more or less synonymous with other sacrificial terms: → אשׁם *'āšām,* → זבח *zāḇaḥ, ḥᵃṭā'â/ḥaṭṭā't,*[25] → מנחה *minḥâ, neseḵ,*[26] → עולה *'ôlâ,* → שׁלמים *šᵉlāmîm, tôḏâ,*[27] *tᵉrûmâ,*[28] and the elliptical → תמיד *tāmîḏ.* Possibly אשׁה *'iššeh* should be added to this group.[29]

Like these terms, *qorbān* appears as the object of verbs meaning "present" or "offer": *hiqrîḇ* (e.g., Lev. 1:2; 7:14), *hēḇî'* (e.g., Lev. 4:23; Nu. 5:15), *nāṯan* (e.g., Ezk. 20:28), and *'āśâ* (e.g., Lev. 9:7).

In construct phrases *qorbān* is associated with the names of those who make the offering: in Nu. 7, the leaders of the Israelite tribes on the day the tabernacle was consecrated (Abidan, v. 65; Ahiezer, v. 71; Ahira, v. 83; Eliab, v. 29; Eliasaph, v. 47; Elizur, v. 35; Elishama, v. 53; Gamaliel, v. 59; Nahshon, v. 17; Nethanel, v. 23; Pagiel, v. 77; Shelumiel, v. 41); also Aaron and his sons (Lev. 6:13[20]) and the people (*'ām,* Lev. 9:7,15). But the *nomen rectum* can also be the recipient of the *qorbān:* God (Lev. 23:14), Yahweh (Nu. 9:7,13; 31:50; cf. 28:2, where the suffix of *qorbānî* refers to Yahweh).

The expressions *qorbān 'iššeh,* "fire offering," in Lev. 22:27 and *qorbān minḥâ,* "grain offering," in 2:1,4,13 should perhaps be understood as explicatives, in which *qorbān* denotes the material offered (*sōleṯ,* "choice flour," in vv. 1aβ,4). In Lev. 2:12, however, *qorbān rē'šîṯ,* "offering of firstfruits," is once again a generic term for *minḥâ.*

Construct phrases in which *qorbān* is the *nomen rectum* include *bᵉśar haqqorbān,* "flesh of the offering" (Ezk. 40:43), *yôm qorbānô,* "day of its [viz., the *zeḇaḥ šᵉlāmîm*] offering" (Lev. 7:15), and *rō'š qorbānô,* "head of the offering [from the herd]" (Lev.

---

24. Daniel, 123.
25. → חטא *ḥāṭā'.*
26. → נסך *nāsaḵ.*
27. → ידה *ydh.*
28. → רום *rûm.*
29. See below.

3:2,8). The phrase *ka'as qorbānām* (Ezk. 20:28) probably refers to an offering that arouses Yahweh's anger at both the action and the material of the offering.[30]

The two instances of the noun *qurbān* (Neh. 10:35[34]; 13:31) occur in combination with *hā'ēṣîm:* the phrase means "wood offering."

2. *Meaning.* In the OT the noun *qorbān,* which belongs to the jargon of the priestly cult, probably derives much of its semantic content from the verb *qāraḇ/hiqrîḇ.* Like the latter, it may have been rooted originally in the realm of friendly, peaceful human intercourse, where the offering of gifts signaled respect (Jgs. 3:17-18) and hospitality (5:25). It would have been easy for such a term to insinuate itself into the sacrificial terminology of cultic worship, where — true to its origins — it remained quite unspecific. The large number of construct phrases in which *qorbān* appears as *nomen regens* with a person suggests that the term is not meant to specify the material offered: its purpose is to state the action of offering as a fact and thus to connect whatever is offered, called *qorbān,* with those doing the offering.

III. Usage. The noun *qorbān,* a "creation of the Priestly Code,"[31] appears exclusively in texts associated with P; in these it represents the broadest term for offering, replacing the similarly broad term *minḥâ* of the early pentateuchal sources.[32] It is remarkable that *qorbān,* despite its generic character, appears nowhere else in the literature of the OT. One possible explanation is that the noun developed from the verb at a relatively late date in the history of Hebrew. That even the two occurrences of *qorbān* in Ezekiel are secondary fits with this theory. Also, possibly, "there was no need to develop a general term outside the limited realm of the cult."[33]

The term appears to be connected neither with specific conceptions of offering nor with particular theological statements that would distinguish it from the general terminology and theology of offering. Only the suffix in Nu. 28:2 suggests the possibility of an emphatic association of God and God's *qorbān* with its sacrificial efficacy *(rēaḥ nîḥōaḥ).*

1. *Generic Term.* The totally nonspecific nature of the *qorbān* is immediately evident from Lev. 1:2-3, the introduction to the first collection of laws governing offerings: "When any *('āḏām)* of you brings a *qorbān.* . . ." There follows an initial differentiation based on the material offered: a *qorbān* of cattle *(min-habbᵉhēmâ)* may be offered *(hiqrîḇ),* from the herd *(bāqār)* or from the flock *(ṣō'n)* (v. 2b). The classification of offerings that follows is based on the nature of the offering, not the material: burnt offering *('ôlâ),* grain offering *(minḥâ),* peace offering *(zeḇaḥ šᵉlāmîm),* sin offering *(ḥaṭṭā'ṯ),* and reparation offering *('āšām).* All of these — reflecting the character of Lev. 1–5 as a list of offerings — are to be understood as varieties of the generic *qorbān.*

---

30. → VII, 285.
31. De Vaux, *Sacrifices,* 31.
32. Gray, 17; → VIII, 412-14.
33. R. Rendtorff, *Leviticus. BK* III/1 (1985), 24.

Similarly general is the introductory instruction in Nu. 28:2: "You shall take care to offer to me at the appointed time my offering *(qorbānî),* my flesh *(laḥmî)* as a fire offering, as a pleasing odor."

2. *Specification.* The actual laws governing offerings, surprisingly, do not preserve this movement from generic to specific; already in Lev. 2:1 the meaning of *qorbān* shifts to the more particular: "When anyone *(nep̱eš)* presents a *minḥâ* to Yahweh, that person shall dust the *qorbān* with choice flour." In this case the semantic contrast can surely be charged to a hand heterogenous to Lev. 1 (note the incoherent shift from *'āḏām* to *nep̱eš*), a writer for whom *qorbān* meant a particular type of *minḥâ.* The collision between these two semantic positions becomes significant in 2:12-13, where the same writer coins the expressions *qorbān rē'šîṯ* ("offering of firstfruits," v. 12), and *qorbān minḥâ* (v. 13), thus further establishing the subordination of *qorbān.* A similar subordination can be observed in 5:11 and 6:13(20), and especially in 7:12ff.,29, where we even find the *qorbān* of a *zeḇaḥ.*

3. *Sacrificial Offering.* The occurrences in Lev. 3–4 revert to the generic meaning and may accordingly be assigned to the same writer as in Lev. 1. Only in 3:2,8, however, is *qorbān* used as a term for the material of the offering; these verses say that those bringing animals to be sacrificed are to lay their hands on the head of their *qorbān.* Several parallels in the immediate context (3:13; 4:4,15,24) make this particular usage of *qorbān* highly significant; an analogous development in the reverse direction appears with *'ôlâ* in 1:4 and with *ḥaṭṭā'ṯ* in 4:29,33.

The occurrences in Lev. 4 (vv. 23,28,32) once again use *qorbān* in the same generic sense as in Lev. 1.

4. *Offering of the People.* In Lev. 9:7,15, *qorbān hā'ām* is the offering of the people, made after the burnt offering of the high priest. According to vv. 15ff., it comprises a sin offering, a burnt offering, a grain offering, and a peace offering (cf. the variant in v. 22; also Nu. 5:15: *qorbān* in the context of an ordeal to determine infidelity). This semantic inclusiveness points back to Lev. 1.

5. *Holiness Code.* The laws of H treat *qorbān* as an inclusive general term for an offering (Lev. 22:18; 23:14),[34] which can nevertheless be particularized by addition of identifying terms (e.g., *'iššeh,* 22:27) or specification of the material (blood, 17:4). This mixture is a sure sign of late language.

6. *Ezekiel.* The same is true of the two occurrences of *qorbān* in the book of Ezekiel; they are both among the tertiary additions. With the expression *qorbān ka'as* in Ezk. 20:28, a redactor has furnished a final negative judgment on the Israelite cult of the high place: "vexatious offerings." To 40:38-43a, itself already a secondary addition de-

34. See III.1 above.

scribing the arrangements in the temple for preparing the sacrificial offerings, a summary reference (v. 43b) has been appended noting the disposition of the *beśar haqqorbān.*

7. *Late Proto-Rabbinic Texts.* Other secondary priestly traditions totally dissolve the established semantic contours of *qorbān.* Here *qorbān* becomes any kind of contribution. The unconventional material distinguishes this usage from that already outlined: covered wagons, gold and silver vessels (28 times in Nu. 7). The use of the vessels to receive the offerings proper *(minḥâ)* provides some continuity.

In Neh. 10:35(34) and 13:31, the word *qurbān* can refer quite generally to the "provision" of firewood for maintaining the altar fire in the postexilic temple.

The *qorbān* of the nazirites in Nu. 6:14ff. also consists of a wealth of individual components.

Nu. 31:50 is difficult to date. In the context of a war with Midian, it speaks of a *qorbān* of the Israelite army to Yahweh from the spoil, consisting of articles of gold, armlets, bracelets, etc. This passage associates *qorbān* with the laws governing the *ḥerem.*[35]

Building on Lev. 22:18, finally, 27:9ff. provides an important instance of inclusion of the *qorbān* in the laws governing vows, which, with this specialized usage of the word, vaguely prefigure the striking usage of the rabbis.

IV. 1. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* In the Dead Sea Scrolls *qrbn* occurs 4 times in Hebrew texts, once in an Aramaic text. An additional 5 occurrences (4 Hebrew, 1 Aramaic [Testament of Levi]) in the unpublished mss. from Qumran caves 2-10 are not yet available for study. In 11QPs[a] 27:2-11, an apocryphal passage concerning David's compositions, *qorbān* in l. 7 refers to the offerings for the Sabbath and new moon; their nature is not defined in substantially greater detail, but they are distinguished from the *tāmîḏ* in l. 6. 11QT 20:13 picks up the requirement of Nu. 18:19-20 that all offerings be sprinkled with salt. When this clause here concludes the instructions concerning the grain offering at the festival of new wine, it is not difficult to recognize the summary character of *qorbān.* In 11QT 43:4 Yadin reconstructs the text as *bmw'd qwrbn h'ṣym,* "on the day of the wood offering." In a description of the "new Jerusalem" (2Q24 fr. 4, 2), the section describing the priestly ritual speaks of *qwrbn r'w',* which Baillet equates with Heb. *mnḥt rṣwn,* "pleasing offering."[36] An unpublished Aramaic version speaks of *mnḥt hqwrbnym.* The Qumran versions of the Testament of Levi (4Q213, 214) use *qrbn* or *qrbn mnḥh* as a collective term for the offerings available to Levi (33:18,21; 36:15).

CD 16:9-15 may foreshadow the treatment of vows by the rabbis (albeit without mention of *qorbān*).[37]

35. → חרם *ḥāram.*

36. M. Baillet, *Les 'petites grottes' de Qumrân. DJD,* III (1962), 87; see Beyer, 222: *r'wt[h . . .].*

37. See IV.2 below.

2. *Late Judaism and Rabbinic Literature.* In Western Aramaic/Late Hebrew inscriptions, *qorbān* clearly stands for any kind of offering at all.[38] An ossuary inscription dating from the period around the birth of Christ reads: "All the profit that anyone acquires through this ossuary is to be an offering for God *(qrbn 'lh)* from him who lies within."[39]

For the rabbis *qorbān* likewise denotes an offering. They distinguish between the *qorbān yāḥîḏ,* "offering of an individual," and the *qorbān ṣibbûr,* "offering of the congregation."[40] Almost without exception, *qorbān* represents a contribution withdrawn from its original use by means of a vow[41] and therefore no longer available for its original purpose. "From here, it is not a long jump to the use of the word as a quite ordinary affirmation, without any religious overtones, although it belonged originally to the domain of religious language."[42] That is, the word was no longer used to express assignment to God but to characterize an object as being unavailable to certain persons.[43]

3. *NT.* This late usage also lies behind Mk. 7:11, where Jesus confronts the commandment to love one's parents with the ingenious Pharisaic interpretation that held that children could annul the support they owed their parents by declaring it *qorbān,* thus removing it once and for all from their parents' reach. The evangelist explains the term to his gentile readers: *korbán, hó estin dṓron,* adopting the standard translation of the word in the LXX as well as the explanation given by Josephus.[44] Mark thus records what was probably the common understanding of the word in contemporary Judaism: *qorbān* is a gift consecrated to God; the act of consecration touches upon the law of vows, which makes it irrevocable.[45] The word *korbanás* in Mt. 27:6 is a Greek equivalent to the Aramaic term; it refers to the temple treasury.[46] Later, Latinized *corban* could designate the poor box.[47]

Fabry

---

38. Beyer, 343, 346.
39. Beyer, 343-44.
40. Jer. *Yoma* 39d.
41. → נדר *nāḏar.*
42. Rengstorf, 862.
43. See A. I. Baumgarten, *"Korban* and the Pharisaic *Paradosis," JANES* 16/17 (1984/85), 5-17; also N. J. Cohen, "Incised Stone Fragment 'Korban' from Southern Wall of Temple Mount," *Dor leDor,* 13 (1985), 235-240.
44. *Ant.* 4.73.
45. See above; Rengstorf, 865-66; St.-B., I, 711-17.
46. Cf. Josephus, *B.J.* 2.175.
47. Cyprian, *CCSL,* III, A, 64.

קָרָה *qārâ;* קָרָא *qārā'* II; מִקְרֶה *miqreh;* קְרִי *q^e^rî*

I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences. II. OT: 1. Qal; 2. Niphal; 3. Hiphil; 4. *miqreh;* 5. *q^e^rî.* III. LXX.

I. 1. *Etymology.* Hebrew uses both the verb *qārâ* and its by-form *qārā'* II; both have the basic meaning "meet." There are a few instances of *qry,* "encounter," in Ugaritic:[1] "'Anat encounters the messengers";[2] "I encounter you on the path of sin."[3] Elsewhere, however, the verb (probably in the D stem) means "present, offer."[4] With *mlḥmt,* "war," it means either "I am against the war" or "I offer war."[5] Other occurrences are disputed.[6] Other cognates include Aram. and Syr. *q^e^rā',* "meet, encounter" (Egyptian Aramaic: "befall"[7]); Arab. *qarā (y),* "receive hospitably, entertain"; and Eth. *'aqāraya,* "bring to." A Punic occurrence is uncertain,[8] as is OSA *qrw,* with a causative meaning "dedicate."[9] The form *liqra't,* ossified as a preposition meaning "toward," derives from the by-form *qr'* (cf. *lqrt* in the Siloah inscription).[10]

2. *Occurrences.* Occasionally occurrences of *qārâ* and *qārā'* appear close together (Gen. 42:4,38: *qr';* 44:29: *qrh;* Dnl. 10:14 *K: qrh; Q: qr'*).

When enumerated mechanically, the qal of *qārâ* occurs 13 times, the qal of *qārā'* 12 (in Josh. 11:20 *liqra't* should be treated as a preposition; the form in Jer. 4:20 more likely represents *qārā'* I). The niphal of *qārâ* occurs 6 times, the niphal of *qārā'* 5; in the hiphil there are 3 occurrences of *qārâ* and 1 of *qārā'.* The piel form (5 times) is a denominative from *qôrâ,* "beam," and means "lay beams."

There are three nominal derivatives of *qārâ: miqreh,* "event, result" (9 times); *q^e^rî,* "hostile encounter" (7 times in Lev. 26); and *qāreh* in *q^e^reh laylâ,* "nocturnal encounter," i.e., emission of semen.

There is some concentration of occurrences in the Joseph story as well as in Ecclesiastes, where *qārâ* and above all *miqreh* have developed into technical terms.

II. OT. 1. *Qal.* Often the verb means simply "befall, happen." Jacob is afraid that harm *('āsôn)* may befall Benjamin (Gen. 42:4,38; in the mouth of the brothers: 44:29).

---

qārâ. S. Amsler, "קרה *qrh* widerfahren," *THAT,* II, 681-84.

1. *WUS,* no. 2454.
2. *KTU,* 1.3, II, 4-5.
3. *KTU,* 1.17, VI, 43; cf. D. Pardee, *UF* 7 (1975) 368.
4. *KTU,* 1.19, IV, 22, 29 par. *š'ly;* cf. M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *UF* 10 (1978) 69.
5. *KTU,* 1.3, III, 14-15; IV, 22, 27.
6. See *UT,* no. 2277.
7. *AP,* 71.18.
8. *DISO,* 264; *HAL,* III, 1138.
9. Biella, 466.
10. *KAI,* 189.4.

In quite general terms 42:29 says that Joseph's brothers told their father "all that had happened to them" *(kol-haqqōrīṯ)* in Egypt, and in 49:1, at the beginning of his "blessing," Jacob says: "I will tell you what will happen to you *('ēṯ ʾašer-yiqrāʾ ʾeṯkem)* in days to come." This meaning is also found in Isa. 41:22; Est. 4:7; 6:13; Dnl. 10:14.

According to Dt. 31:29, disaster *(rāʿâ)* will befall the people if they do not keep the commandments; according to Jer. 44:23, disaster *(rāʿâ)* has befallen the people because they have been disobedient. When Jerusalem asks, "Why have these things befallen me?" the answer is: "On account of your great iniquity" (Jer. 13:22). Deutero-Isaiah says that a double disaster (*šeṯayim hēnnâ,* "these two things") has befallen Jerusalem: devastation and destruction, famine and sword (Isa. 51:19). In Lev. 10:19, too, the notion of punishment lies in the background. Aaron says that, even though his sons Nadab and Abihu offered sacrifice, "such things" *(kāʾēlleh)* have befallen them — in fact, they committed a ritual transgression (v. 1). "Iniquity" *(ʿāwôn)* is at issue again in 1 S. 28:10, where Saul swears to the medium at Endor: "No (punishment for) iniquity shall come upon you."

War may "take place" (or "befall" someone) (Ex. 1:10, reading *tiqrāʾēnû* for *tiqreʾnâ*).

According to Job 4:14, dread *(paḥaḏ)* and trembling *(reʿāḏâ)* "come upon" Eliphaz during the night, and he experiences a kind of revelation concerning human destiny. In Nu. 11:23 Yahweh says to Moses: "Now you shall see whether my word befalls you [i.e., comes true for you] or not."

Totally obscure is Prov. 27:16: *šemen yemînô yiqrāʾ,* "oil encounters his right hand." Possibly v. 16 continues v. 15: just as one cannot restrain the wind, just as an object smeared with oil slips out of one's hand, so it is impossible to restrain or escape a contentious wife. According to Isa. 41:2, *ṣeḏeq* will encounter Cyrus — i.e., he will be victorious.

Only once, in conjunction with *miqreh,* does the qal of *qārâ* express a chance event (Ruth 2:3): the field where Ruth was gleaning just happened to belong to Boaz (*wayyiqer miqrehā,* lit. "her hap encountered the field"). Here *miqreh* is "what takes place without the design or cooperation of the person affected").[11] The narrator knows, however, that behind this happenstance stands God's providence.

2. *Niphal.* The niphal expresses a similar notion: the young man who brings David the news of Saul's death says, "I happened to be *(niqrōʾ niqrêṯî)* on Mount Gilboa" (2 S. 1:6). Here, however, it would be hard to speak of divine providence. Similar is the law in Dt. 22:6: "If you happen upon [*kî yiqqārēʾ . . . lepānêḵā,* 'there appears before you'] a bird's nest with fledglings or eggs." Another passage in this category is 2 S. 18:9: Absalom happened to meet David's warriors *(wayyiqārēʾ . . . lipnê).* Even more indefinite is 2 S. 20:1.

Chance thus seems to play a role in everyday usage of this root. As soon as theological reflection rears its head, however, divine providence appears behind chance. Ex. 21:13 expresses the difference between intentional murder and unintentional homicide

11. G. Gerleman, *Ruth. BK* XVIII (1981), 25.

by saying that in the latter case "it came about by an act of God." This verse uses the rare verb *'innâ*, which in the pual means "befall" (Ps. 91:10: "no evil [*rā'â*] shall befall you"; Prov. 12:21: "no harm befalls the righteous").

Elsewhere the niphal means "let oneself be met," i.e., "show oneself, reveal oneself." Moses is to say to Pharaoh: "Yahweh has met with us, has revealed himself to us" (Ex. 3:18; cf. 5:3). In Nu. 23, the story of Balaam, this expression occurs 4 times. Balaam says to Balak: "Perhaps Yahweh will come to meet me *(yiqqārēh . . . liqrā'ṯî)*" (v. 3). In the next verse we are told that Yahweh met *(wayyiqqār 'el)* Balaam. The same sequence is repeated in vv. 15-16, except that v. 15 uses an indefinite expression: *wᵉ'ānōkî 'iqqāreh kōh.*

3. *Hiphil.* In the hiphil forms any possibility of chance is ruled out. Here when something befalls someone, it is brought about by Yahweh. Thus in Gen. 24:12 Abraham's slave prays, "Let me encounter (something) today," i.e., "Grant me success."

Jacob tells his father how he found the game so quickly: "Yahweh made it encounter me" (Gen. 27:20). What appeared to be simply the luck of the hunt was in fact Yahweh's doing. In Jer. 32:23 we read that, because of the people's disobedience, God "made all this disaster *(rā'â)* come upon them" (cf. the use of the qal with *rā'â*[12]).

Nu. 35:11 stands out as unique. The Israelites are to "select" cities of refuge *(hiqrîṯem lāḵem 'ārîm).* These cities "are to be an opportunity that meets the need."[13]

4. *miqreh.* The noun *miqreh* denotes "something that takes place by itself, without intent or cooperation on the part of the person affected and without a visible author."[14] This is clear in 1 S. 6:9: the Philistines want to discover whether the terrible disaster *(rā'â)* that has struck them comes from God or is a *miqreh,* an accident. This presents a problem: does the author of the passage consider this question, put in the mouth of the Philistines, to be "pagan," i.e., incompatible with Yahwism, or does it reflect language current in Israel? In fact, Yahweh turns out to be the author of the disaster. Ruth 2:3 probably also represents a vernacular idiom.[15]

When David absents himself from the new moon feast of the king, Saul thinks his absence is a *miqreh,* suggesting that David might have become unclean — which of course could happen without any intent on his part (1 S. 20:26).

In Ecclesiastes *miqreh* is a technical term for fate or destiny. The same fate befalls *(miqreh 'eḥāḏ yiqreh)* the wise and the fool, and Qoheleth concludes: the fate of the fool will also befall me (Eccl. 2:14-15). Human existence appears to be meaningless. Humans and animals face the same fate: all must die (3:19 — again *miqreh*). The argument is repeated in 9:2-3, expanded by the addition of several antitheses: *ṣaddîq* and *rāšā',* the good and the evil,[16] the clean and the unclean, those who sacrifice and those

12. See II.1 above.
13. Holzinger, *KHC* 4, 170.
14. *HAL,* II, 629.
15. See II.1 above.
16. With LXX, Syr., and Vg.; not in MT.

who do not sacrifice. The author continues: "As are the good, so are the sinners *(kaṭôḇ kaḥōṭe')*; those who swear are like those who shun an oath." In sum: "The same fate comes to everyone." This fact is called *ra'*, "evil." Whether God stands behind this fate or the author is simply stating an observable fact without raising the question of its author is not immediately clear.

5. *qᵉrî.* The noun *qᵉrî* appears 7 times in later additions to the blessing and curse section of H (Lev. 26). Here *hālaḵ qᵉrî/biqrî 'im* means "be hostile to (God)" (vv. 21,23,27,40), glossed in v. 21 by "refuse to obey me" *(lō' tō'ḇû lišmōa' lî)*, in v. 23 by "refuse correction" (*ysr* niphal), in v. 27 by "disobey," and in v. 40 by "iniquity" *('āwôn)* and "treachery" *(ma'al)*. The divine reaction reflects the human provocation: God will be hostile (vv. 24,28,41), glossed in v. 24 by "strike (*nkh* hiphil) sevenfold," in v. 28 by "punish (*ysr* piel) sevenfold" (here also *baḥᵃmaṯ-qerî*, "in fury"), and in v. 41 by "bring into the land of their enemies." In other words, there is an intensification of the punishment of hostility.

The noun *qᵉrî* also appears in CD 20:29, where the members of the community acknowledge that they, like their fathers, have walked contrary to the ordinances of the covenant (cf. 4QDibHam[a] frs. 1-2, 6:6).

III. LXX. The translation of the LXX is extremely varied. The most frequent equivalent is *symbaínein*, "meet" (7 times), followed by compounds of *antán: apantán* (3 times), *synantán* (6 times), *hypantán* (once), along with *peripíptein* and *períptōma*, "chance" (Ruth 2:3; 2 S. 1:6). For *miqreh* in Ecclesiastes, the LXX always uses *synántēma;* elsewhere it uses *períptōma* twice and *sýmptōma* once. The expression *hālaḵ qᵉrî* is rendered by *plágios poreúein.*

Ringgren

קֶרַח *qeraḥ*

I. Ancient Near East. II. Occurrences. III. Usage: 1. Cold; 2. Ice. IV. LXX.

I. Ancient Near East. As the climatic data would lead one to expect, the mention of ice or frost is as uncommon throughout the ancient Near East as it is in the OT. Cognates of *qeraḥ* are found in Arabic *(qarisa)*, Jewish Aramaic and Samaritan *(qwrḥ)*, Syriac *(qarḥā)*, and Neo-Assyrian *(qarḫu)*.[1]

---

qeraḥ. G. Dalman, *AuS,* I, esp. 218ff.; O. Keel, *Jahwe-Visionen und Siegelkunst. SBS* 84/85 (1977), esp. 254-55; H. Graf Reventlow, "Frost," *BHHW,* I, 503.

1. *HAL,* III, 1140.

II. Occurrences. The noun *qeraḥ* occurs 7 times in the OT: Gen. 31:40; Job 6:16; 37:10; 38:29; Ps. 147:17; Jer. 36:30; Ezk. 1:22. It is not found in Sirach or the Dead Sea Scrolls.

III. Usage.

1. *Cold.* Since temperatures below freezing are rare in Palestine, in texts local to that region *qeraḥ* can hardly mean "frost" in our sense of the word; more likely it refers to perceptible cold. In Gen. 31:36-42, for example, Jacob reproaches Laban for his treatment of him during his time of service; in v. 40 he complains about the unpleasant cold by night, in contrast to the unbearable heat *(ḥōreḇ)* by day. This combination does not suggest a temperature below freezing. The hendiadys is probably meant to state that Jacob performed his service in all kinds of weather, accepting many privations.

A similar combination of heat and cold appears in Jer. 36:30, which states that the body of Jehoiakim will be exposed to the heat (again *ḥōreḇ*) by day and the cold by night, thus remaining unburied for at least a day. To see this as an element of judgment is probably correct.[2] In Gen. 31:40, however, this notion is irrelevant. The same idea occurs in Gen. 8:22, where the two words used are *qōr* and *ḥōm.*

2. *Ice.* The three occurrences in the book of Job, which reflects more the experience of Israel's neighbors and characterizes the speakers as non-Israelites, show clearly that, despite the generally warm climate, ice was not unknown. In 6:16, for example, Job complains about the deceitful conduct of his companions, who appear as dark as the freshets clouded by the runoff of melting (ice or) snow. In 37:10 Elihu appeals to the greatness of God, which he underlines by stating that the breath of God produces ice, which freezes water in place. The phrase "breath of God" is probably a poetic expression for the chilling wind, associating it with God. In God's own answer to Job, a rhetorical question attributes the formation of ice to God (38:29). The following verse may also suggest the formation of hail. Hail is clearly intended in Ps. 147:17: only in this form can Yahweh be said to hurl *qeraḥ.* Here again *qeraḥ* (par. *qārâ*) appears in the context of praising God as creator.

The meaning of *qeraḥ* in the vision of Ezekiel is disputed. According to Ezk. 1:22, the prophet sees something like a dome, which is likened to *haqqeraḥ hannôrā'.* In interpreting this expression, Zimmerli appeals to the LXX translation *krýstallos;* he therefore prefers the translation "crystal," to describe the glow emanating from the dome.[3] Since the meaning of *qeraḥ* elsewhere is unambiguous, there is no reason to translate it here as "crystal": an intense glow can emanate from clear frozen water.[4] The qualifying word "awesome" is due to the presence of God; the vision expresses this presence, which is also felt in the freezing of the water (cf. Job 37:10; 38:29; Ps. 146:17).[5]

---

2. Keel, 255.
3. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 122.
4. Keel, 254-55.
5. For a further discussion of the numinous in this context, see Keel, 255.

IV. LXX. To translate *qeraḥ*, the LXX uses *krýstallos* in four passages (Job 6:16; 38:29; Ps. 147:17; Ezk. 1:22), *págos* in one (Job 37:10). In Gen. 31:40 it renders *qeraḥ ballāylâ* as *pagetṓ tḗs nyktós.*

Hausmann

קרח II → גלח *gillaḥ*

קִרְיָה *qiryâ*; קֶרֶת *qereṯ*

I. Etymology and Meaning. II. Occurrences: 1. Toponyms; 2. Other. III. Ancient Versions and Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Etymology and Meaning. According to Nöldeke, *qiryâ* and *qereṯ*, two Hebrew words for "city" that also occur frequently in toponyms, are closely associated with → קיר *qîr,* because they are derived from a biconsonantal base *qar.*[1] Blau stresses the shift from a biconsonantal root to a root *tertiae y* for Ugar. *qryt (qarītu)*,[2] although in Ugaritic we find both *qryt* and *qrt.*[3] Dahood considers these to be alternative forms, like Heb. *qiryâ* and *qereṯ.*[4] Others suggest that *qiryâ* derives from the root *qrh,* "meet,"[5] although this derivation is rejected by Rabin, who sees a connection with Hitt. *gurta* and Sanskrit *kṛta,* with the same meaning.[6] The noun *qiryâ* is common in Aramaic, appearing, e.g., in the Sefire inscriptions,[7] in Egyptian Aramaic documents,[8] and in Palmyrene inscriptions.[9] In Syriac we find the equivalent *qᵉrîṯāʾ,* albeit with the broken

---

qiryâ. F. S. Frick, *The City in Ancient Israel. SBLDS* 36 (Missoula, 1977); D. Sohlberg, "The Translation of קרח in the Septuagint," *Tarbiz* 40 (1970/71) 508-9; G. Wallis, "Die Stadt in der Überlieferung der Genesis," *ZAW* 78 (1966) 133-48.

1. T. Nöldeke, *Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft* (Strasbourg, 1904), 62 n. 1; *NBSS,* 131. See also *BLe,* §51b′; *HAL,* III, 1142; Frick, 42.
2. J. Blau, *UF* 11 (1979) 57-58; *KTU,* 1.3, II, 28; IV, 9.
3. Cf. *KTU,* 1.3, II, 6-7 with 1.3, II, 20 and also 2.72, 16, 19; J. Blau and S. E. Loewenstamm, *UF* 2 (1970) 27; J. C. de Moor and K. Spronk, *UF* 14 (1982) 163.
4. M. Dahood, *Bibl* 52 (1971) 350.
5. *BDB,* 900; see also B. Margalit, *UF* 16 (1984) 151. Cf. I. Eitan, *JQR* 15 (1924/25) 421: "(popular) assembly."
6. C. Rabin, *Or* 32 (1963) 125-26.
7. *KAI,* 222A.33(?); 222B.36; 224.12.
8. *AP,* 5.9; 13.10; etc.
9. J. Starcky, *MUSJ* 38 (1962) 133, l. 6; *DISO,* 266; Beyer, 686.

pl. (collective) *qûryā'*.[10] The form *qrt* occurs in Phoenician and Punic, e.g., in the Karatepe inscriptions;[11] cf. also *qrtḥdšt,* "Carthage." In Modern Arabic we still find *qarya,* "village,"[12] like OSA *qrtyn,* "village, settlement."[13]

II. Occurrences.

1. *Toponyms.* Quite a few OT toponyms incorporate the element *qiryâ:*[14] Kiriath-arba, "city of the four quarters(?)"[15] or "city of the four tribes,"[16] is an ancient name for Hebron (Gen. 23:2; 35:27; Josh. 14:15; 15:13,54; 20:7; 21:11; Jgs. 1:10; Neh. 11:25), modern Jebel er-Rumeidah near Hebron. Kiriath-baal (Josh. 15:60; 18:14), also called simply Baalah (Josh. 15:9-10; 1 Ch. 13:6),[17] is another name for Kiriath-jearim[18] (Josh. 9:17; 15:9 [= Baalah], 60; 18:14-15; Jgs. 18:12 [twice]; 1 S. 6:21; 7:1-2; Jer. 26:20; Neh. 7:29; 1 Ch. 2:50,52-53; 13:5-6; 2 Ch. 1:4), also called *qiryaṯ 'ārîm* (Ezr. 2:25) and simply Kiriath (Josh. 18:28). This city was probably associated originally with Benjamin and later with Judah; it was located some 9 mi. northwest of Jerusalem, and may possibly be identified with modern Deir el-Azhar.[19] Kiriath-huzoth, "city of alleys," a Moabite city of uncertain location,[20] is mentioned only in Nu. 22:39. Kiriath-sannah is identified with Debir in Josh. 15:49; but the text is highly uncertain (LXX *pólis grammátōn;* Syr. refers to Kiriath-sefer [probably an error based on vv. 15-16]),[21] although Noth attempts to maintain that the reading Kiriath-sannah is correct,[22] locating the city in the southern region of Judah. Kiriath-sefer, "city of the book," is mentioned in Josh. 15:15-16 and Jgs. 1:11-12, and is equated with Debir. It is uncertain whether Debir is to be identified with Tell Beit Mirsim, Zahariyeh, Khirbet Tarrameh, or Khirbet er-Rabud (all southwest of Hebron).[23]

In addition to these place names compounded with *qiryat,* we find names using *(haq)qᵉrîyôṯ* (Jer. 48:24; Am. 2:2):[24] Kerioth-hezron in Judah (Josh. 15:25) and Kiriathaim (apparently the dual of *qiryâ*[25]), a name applied to several sites: (a) in Moab (Jer. 48:1,23; Ezk. 25:9 *Q*); in Reuben (Gen. 14:5; Nu. 32:37; Josh. 13:19), elsewhere

10. *LexSyr,* 695-96; on Ezr. 4:10 see *BLe,* §90g; J. Naveh, *WO* 6 (1970/71) 45.
11. *KAI,* 26A, II, 9, 17; III, 5, 7, 15; etc.; *DISO,* 267.
12. Wehr, 761.
13. W. W. Müller, *ZAW* 75 (1963) 314; Biella, 467.
14. *HAL,* III, 1142-43; H. P. Rüger, *BHHW,* II, 956.
15. *GTTOT,* §736.
16. E. Lipiński, *VT* 24 (1974) 48ff.
17. M. J. Mulder, *Ba'al in het OT* (Hague, 1962), 166.
18. → יער *ya'ar,* II.1.
19. *GTTOT,* §§314, 319.F.1, 1016; also *HAL,* III, 1143.
20. *GTTOT,* §§447-48; A. H. van Zyl, *The Moabites. POS* 3 (1960), 83, 85; *HAL,* III, 1143.
21. See also *GTTOT,* §319.A.5; *HAL,* III, 1143.
22. *ABLAK,* I, 205.
23. *Ibid.,* I, 204-9; *GTTOT,* §514; *HAL,* II, 212; III, 1143; *et al.*
24. Cf. *KAI,* 181.13; according to van Zyl, *Moabites,* 83, the names denote two different Moabite cities; but cf. *HAL,* III, 1143; and G. Sauer, *BHHW,* II, 934.
25. *GK,* §8c.

written *qrtyn;*[26] (b) in Naphtali (1 Ch. 6:61[Eng. 76]), also called Kartan (Josh. 21:32);[27] and Kartah, a city in Zebulun (Josh. 21:34).[28]

2. *Other.* Apart from toponyms, the word *qiryâ* appears 30 times in the Hebrew OT (Nu. 21:28; Dt. 2:36; 3:4; 1 K. 1:41,45; Isa. 1:21,26; 22:2; 24:10; 25:2,3; 26:5; 29:1; 32:13; 33:20; Jer. 48:41; 49:25; Hos. 6:8; Mic. 4:10; Hab. 2:8,12,17; Ps. 48:3[2]; Job 39:7; Prov. 10:15; 11:10; 18:11,19; 29:8; Lam. 2:11; plus Sir. 33:18 [= 36:12]; 49:6 [= 49:8]); *qereṯ* appears 5 times (Job 29:7; Prov. 8:3; 9:3,14; 11:11). In the Aramaic section of Ezra, *qiryâ (qiryᵉṯā')* appears 9 times (4:10,12,13,15 [3 times],16,19,21), almost always referring to Jerusalem (only in v. 10 does it refer to Samaria).

Usually *qiryâ* occurs in poetic (possibly dialectal?) language; it may be considered synonymous with → עִיר *'îr,* unless it suggests a town fortified with walls, a "fortress" or "citadel." But this latter idea is also suggested by *'îr.* Occasionally the ancient versions appear to be in doubt whether *qiryâ* represents the name of a city: in Jer. 48:41, e.g., LXX reads *Akkariēth,* Vg. *Carioth.*

Nu. 21:28 speaks of a fire from Heshbon in parallel with a flame from the city of Sihon, the Amorite king. Other texts, too, used *qiryâ* primarily for Transjordanian cities (Dt. 2:36; 3:4; Jer. 48:41), probably referring to fortified cities with high walls (*śgb,* Isa. 26:5; cf. Jer. 48:41).[29] Individual cities are often called *qiryâ:* Gilead, "a city of evildoers" (Hos. 6:8);[30] Damascus, "city of joy" (Jer. 49:25); an unidentified city, probably to be understood collectively (Hab. 2:8,12,17); and above all Jerusalem.

In 1 K. 1:41,45, one of the few prose texts in the Hebrew OT that uses *qiryâ,* the word refers particularly to the populace within the walls of Jerusalem.[31] But prophetic poetry, especially in the book of Isaiah, often calls Jerusalem *qiryâ* as well as *'îr;* these passages do not immediately suggest the city within the walls. The word refers primarily to the inhabitants of the city in general: the "faithful city" has become a whore, but will become once again a city of righteousness (Isa. 1:21,26); it is a "jubilant city" (22:2; 32:13). Its name is Zion, "the city of our festivals" (33:20), or "the city of the great king" (Ps. 48:3[2]), "Ariel, the city that David besieged" (Isa. 29:1).

The word also appears in the so-called Apocalypse of Isaiah;[32] here, however, it refers not to Jerusalem but to the "world city": Isa. 24:10 ("city of chaos"); 25:2,3 ("the fortified city has become a ruin," which "cities of ruthless nations will fear"[33]); 26:5 ("lofty city"). Lam. 2:11, however, refers once more to Jerusalem ("infants and babes

26. *KAI,* 181.10.
27. *HAL,* III, 1143.
28. *GTTOT,* §337, no. 38; *HAL,* III, 1150.
29. See also P. Lohmann, *ZAW* 37 (1917/18) 13.
30. But see H. H. Hirschberg, *VT* 11 (1961) 383: "gathering place" instead of "city"; H. Y. Priebatsch, *UF* 9 (1977) 252 n. 12: "assembly."
31. M. J. Mulder, *Koningen. COT* (1987), 73.
32. → XI, 64-65.
33. J. A. Emerton, *ZAW* 89 (1977) 64-73.

faint in the streets of the city"), as do Mic. 4:10 (daughter Zion must "go forth from the city") and Sir. 33:18 (= 36:12); 49:6(8).

Proverbs alternates between *qiryâ* and *qereṯ,* using both in the general sense of "city" or "citadel." Wisdom personified calls aloud "beside the gates where the city begins" (8:3), and her servant girls summon people "from the heights of the citadel" (9:3). But Lady "Folly," too, sits on a seat "by the citadel."

These words appear also in other proverbs: the wealth of the rich is "like a fortress" (10:15; 18:11). "The city" rejoices when it goes well with the righteous; "the city" is exalted by the blessing of the upright (11:10-11). An "offended" brother is "more impregnable than a fortified city" (18:19), and scoffers "set a city aflame" (29:8). According to Job 39:7, the wild ass scorns the tumult of the "the city." In 29:7 Job describes himself as going "up to the city" through the gate.

III. Ancient Versions and Dead Sea Scrolls. Almost without exception (*mētrópolis* in Isa. 1:26), the LXX uses *pólis* to translate *qiryâ;* this is also its usual translation of *'îr.*[34] It uses different words, however, to translate *qereṯ.*[35] The Vg. usually uses *civitas* for *qiryâ;* only in Numbers and Deuteronomy do we find the translation *oppidum.* The Syr. varies among *karkā',* *qᵉrîṯā',* and *mᵉḏittā'.* In the Tg. we usually find *qartā',* rarely *karkā'* or *qiryā.*

As 1QpHab 12:7 shows, the Qumran community (like Tg.) interpreted the word *qiryâ* in Hab. 2:17 as a reference to Jerusalem, where the "wicked priest" performs his repulsive acts.

A description of the "new Jerusalem" (5Q15 fr. 1, 1:5) speaks of a central street *(mṣy'')* running through the middle of the city *(qryt').* All the streets of this city are paved with white stone (1:6).

Mulder

---

34. H. Srathmann, "πόλις," *TDNT,* VI, 522.
35. See Sohlberg.

קֶרֶן *qeren;* קָרַן *qāran*

I. 1. Other Languages; 2. Mythology and Magic. II. 1. Occurrences; 2. Versions. III. 1. Animal Horns; 2. Extended Usage. IV. Religious Usage: 1. Cult; 2. Horns of the Altar; 3. Power; 4. Dead Sea Scrolls.

---

qeren. Y. Aharoni, "The Horned Altar of Beer-sheba," *BA* 37 (1974) 2-6; E. Brunner-Traut and E. Hickmann, "Horn," *LexÄg,* III, 9-11; E. D. van Buren, "Concerning the Horned Cap of the

I. 1. *Other Languages.* The word *qeren* clearly belongs to an exceptionally early stage of civilization, since it is found not only in all the Semitic languages but also in Indo-European (root **ker*[*ö*], Goth. *haurn,* Gk. *kéras,* Lat. *cornu*) with the original meaning "horn (of an animal)," from which various figurative senses arose. The Greek and Latin words refer also to objects made of horn, such as wind instruments and drinking vessels, as well as to horn-shaped formations (a mountain peak, a wing of an army, etc.); the Latin word also refers to physical prowess and courage. In all the Semitic languages the word has the meaning "horn(s) of an animal," from which various usages evolved by metonymy and metaphor in the different languages.[1]

Cognates include: Akk. *qarnu,* which is also used for vessels and objects with horn-like points (moon, stars), as well as symbolizing power;[2] Ugar. *qrn;*[3] Pun. *qrny* (dual);[4] Arab. *qarn,* which also means trumpet, peak, temple, lock (of hair), and ray;[5] Eth. *qarn* (signal horn, power); Aram. *qeren/qarnā'* (also: instrument, corner, power); similarly Syriac (pinnacle, margin), Palmyrene (corner), and Middle Hebrew (corner, peak, ray, power). The Middle Hebrew meaning "(original) stock" may reflect a homonym.

2. *Mythology and Magic.* The horns that adorn the heads of cattle, rams, he-goats, gazelles, and other animals serve as effective weapons; since time immemorial they have evoked in humans mixed feelings of fascination and fear. Horns embody the concentrated animal beauty and power of the creature. Even in the Stone Age, people used horns as weapons and made of them tools and containers. Serving as a plow, a horn

Mesopotamian Gods," *Or* 12 (1943) 318-27; E. Cassin, *La splendeur divine* (Hague, 1968), esp. 9-15; J. R. Conrad, *The Horn and the Sword* (New York, 1957); A. Coudert, "Horns," *Encyclopedia of Religion,* VI (1987), 462-63; F. Dornseiff, *Antike und Alter Orient* (²1959), esp. 269-70; A. Eberharter, "Das Horn im Kult des ATs," *ZTK* 51 (1927) 394-99; J. A. MacCulloch, "Horns," *ERE,* VI, 791-96; J. de Fraine, "Moses' 'cornuta facies' (Ex 34,29-35)," *Bijdragen* 20 (1959) 28-37; K. Galling, *Der Altar in den Kulturen des alten Orients* (1925), esp. 65-67; K. Jaroš, "Des Mose 'strahlende Haut,'" *ZAW* 88 (1976) 275-80; A. Jirku, "Die Gesichtsmaske des Mose," *ZDPV* 67 (1944/45) 43-45; G. Jobes, "Horn," *Dictionary of Mythology Folklore and Symbols,* I (1961), 782-83; O. Keel, *The Symbolism of the Biblical World* (Eng. trans. New York, 1978); *idem, Wirkmächtige Siegeszeichen im AT. OBO* 5 (1974), esp. 125-46; H. M. Kümmel and W. Stauder, "Horn," *RLA,* IV, 469-71; G. Loud, *The Megiddo Ivories* (Chicago, 1939), esp. 10; P. D. Miller, "Animal Names as Designations in Ugaritic and Hebrew," *UF* 2 (1970) 177-86; S. Niditch, *The Symbolic Vision in Biblical Tradition. HSM* 30 (Chico, 1983), 122-24; P. A. Porter, *Metaphors and Monsters. CBOT* 20 (1983), esp. 64-69; J. Conrad et al., "Horns," in R. Cavendish, *Man, Myth and Magic,* 12 vols. (New York, ²1983), V, 1343-52; J. M. Sasson, "Bovine Symbolism in the Exodus Narrative," *VT* 18 (1968) 380-87; I. Scheftelowitz, "Das Hörnermotiv in den Religionen," *ARW,* 15 (1912), 450ff.; F. J. Stendebach, "Altarformen im kanaanäisch-israelitischen Raum," *BZ* 20 (1976) 180-96; M. L. Süring, *The Horn-Motif in the Hebrew Bible and Related Ancient Near Eastern Literature and Iconography. Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series* 4 (1980); G. Wallis, "Horn," *BHHW,* II, 749.

1. *HAL,* III, 1144-45.
2. *AHw,* II, 904; *CAD,* Q, 134-40.
3. *UT,* no. 2279; M. Dahood, *RSP,* I, 331, nos. 500-502.
4. *KAI,* 69.5.
5. *CML,* 143 n. 34.

splits open the body of mother earth; its shape suggests phallic associations. Early on, therefore, the horn became a sign of respect and power, fertility and abundance. By means of magical manipulation, probably in connection with the worship of an animal totem or a theriomorphic deity, people hoped to use for their own purposes the forces indwelling the horn. Later they adorned deities with horns as a sign of their majesty; this symbolism was then adopted by the rulers and leaders appointed by the gods. Horns were also perceived in association with the powerful heavenly bodies that bestowed fertility: the rays of the sun, the crescent moon.

We find evidence of the important conceptual and ritual role played by the horns of animals in pictures and masks, myths and folktales, cultic ceremonies and popular customs observed in the most varied cultures from ancient times to the present. From the prehistoric period come a picture of a fertility goddess holding a buffalo horn and cave paintings of dancing magicians, their heads adorned with horns. Temple paintings and carvings from India and the Fiji Islands, Native American statuettes and illustrations of Celtic gods and goddesses, Greek satyrs and cultic symbols in Minoan palaces, goat dances and bull fights, images of demons and devil — all prominently display a horn or pair of horns.

The same holds true for the ancient Near East. In Egypt horns were a sign of majestic power: gods and goddesses (including Osiris, the "lord of horns," Re, Horus, Amun, Isis, and Hathor) were often portrayed wearing ram or cow horns, or horned headgear; the victorious warrior-king was depicted as an ox goring an enemy citadel with his sharp horns.[6] The crescent moon, depicted as similar in shape to the horns of cattle, was considered a symbol of growth. Metaphorically, the word represents a threat: the supplicant seeks help when "the horns of the enemy grow mighty."[7] The Egyptian words *ʿb* and *ḥnw.t* (cf. Heb. *ḥᵃnîṯ*), "horn," refer also to the horns of the crown; *db* refers to a horn hollowed out to hold oil, the crescent moon, etc.[8]

In Mesopotamia gods were depicted with a pair of horns in the earliest period, but by the Akkadian period this attribute had developed into the multiple horned crown worn by such figures as Enlil, Marduk, and Ramman. The phrase *nāš qarnī*, "horn bearer," is an attribute of Nergal. The sun god Shamash and the moon god Sin *(bēl qarnī)* are horned. The goddess Ninlil, like a wild cow, tears her enemies to pieces with her mighty horns; Bel cuts off Tiamat's horns. The Babylonian and Assyrian kings then appropriated these symbolic horns as a sign of the power bestowed on them by the gods.

Of course the theriomorphic notions that the West Semitic peoples associated with their deities were subject to substantial change, but Canaanite mythology often pictured the gods in the form of an animal with horns. In the Ugaritic pantheon El bears the epithet *ṯr*, "bull."[9] Baal, the young ox, encounters ʿAnat in the form of a cow;[10] in

---

6. *ANEP*, 92-93, nos. 296-97.
7. *Book of the Dead* 64.10.
8. *WbÄS*, I, 173; III, 109-10; V, 434.
9. *KTU*, 1.6, IV, 10, etc.; A. Jirku, *Kanaanäische Mythen und Epen aus Ras Schamra-Ugarit* (Gütersloh, 1962), 19.33-35, etc.
10. *KTU*, 1.5, V, 18-22; Jirku, 61.

their struggle he attacks like a wild ox and makes his horn shine.[11] Yeraḥ, the moon god, is renewed with his right horn.[12] Tyrian Melqart, Syrian Hadad, and the goddess Astarte wear horns or horned headgear.[13] The name of a Punic god Balcarnensis (*ba'al qarnayim,* "lord of the horns") appears on monuments.[14] In like manner, the Canaanite kings wear caps, helmets, and crowns with horns.[15]

II. 1. *Occurrences.* In the Hebrew OT, the noun (fem.) appears as an appellative 76 times: 28 times in the singular, 16 times in the dual *(qarnayim/qᵉrānayim,* const. *qarnê),* and 32 times in the plural *(qᵉrānôṯ,* const. *qarnôṯ).* It appears 14 times in the Aramaic portions. With few exceptions (Ezk. 27:15; Ps. 75:11[Eng. 10]; Zec. 2:1-4[1:18-21]), the plural form refers to the horns of the altar. To these occurrences may be added certain personal names and toponyms: one of Job's daughters is called *qeren happûḵ,* "(eye-)paint horn," a name that points to the use of animals horns as containers. Gen. 14:5 mentions a town called *'ašᵉrōṯ qarnayim.* The second word can hardly refer to a geomorphological feature (e.g., "two hills"; cf. Isa. 5:1); it is probably a qualification of the name Astarte, the goddess of war and fertility: "horned."[16] Recent exegetes also find an allusion to this toponym in Am. 6:13. The rare verbal forms (qal in Ex. 34:29-35;[17] hiphil in Ps. 69:32[31]) derive from the noun: "have horns."

The Dead Sea Scrolls, following OT usage closely, usually use the word in the figurative sense of "power, strength";[18] but we also find "horns turned to iron" (1QSb 5:26; cf. 1 K. 22:11; Mic. 4:13) and horn used as material for a sword hilt (1QM 5:14).

2. *Versions.* Almost without exception, the LXX and Vg. content themselves with the translations *kéras/cornu,* "horn (of an animal)," reflecting the basic meaning of *qeren.* But the Greek translation also uses *sálpinx* for the musical instrument (Dnl. 3:5-15), *sthénos,* "strength," for the *qeren* "laid in the dust" in Job's lament (Job 16:15), and *tópos,* "place," in Isa. 5:1, with reference to the location of a vineyard. The reading *kephalḗ* of LXX^A in Lam. 2:17 can hardly be relied on. Noteworthy is the differing treatment of the verbal forms: in Ps. 68:32 (MT 69:32[31]), describing a bull, the LXX uses *kérata ekphérein,* "armed with horns"; in Ex. 34:29-35, describing the face of Moses, it uses *doxázein,* "shine." In one text the Latin version diverges from MT *(qeren)* and LXX *(kéras),* employing semantic reconstruction: *regnum* ("kingdom").

The Tg. exhibits a wide range of semantic clarifications: *zyqwqyn,* "tongues of fire" (Hab. 3:4); *nksyn,* "possessions" (Am. 6:13); *pwrqn,* "deliverance" (Ezk. 29:21); *mlkwt,* "kingdom" (Jer. 48:25); *twqp',* "strength"; etc.

---

11. Jirku, 74.32.
12. Jirku, 127.
13. See *'ašᵉrōṯ qarnayim* in II.1 below.
14. *KAI,* II, 77.
15. Loud, pl. 22, no. 125.
16. H. Ringgren, in C. J. Bleeker and G. Widengren, eds., *Historia Religionum,* I (Leiden, 1969), 207.
17. See IV.3 below.
18. See IV.4 below.

III. 1. *Animal Horns.* OT texts speak literally or figuratively of the horns of certain animals, such as the ox and bull (Ps. 69:32[31]) or the aurochs[19] (NRSV "wild ox"). The latter may be a symbol of majesty and power (Dt. 33:17) or of peril (Ps. 22:22[21]). The ram, "master of horns" (Dnl. 8:6,20), charges in all directions; the he-goat attacking the ram breaks both its horns (8:3-7). Ram and bellwether butt the weaker members of the flock with their horns, scattering them far and near (Ezk. 34:17-21). A ram is caught by its horns in a thicket (Gen. 22:13).

A catalog of wares imported from distant lands includes *qarnôṯ šēn,* "horns of ivory" (Ezk. 27:15), referring to elephant tusks as "horns."[20]

The shofar (*šôp̄ār;* cf. Akk. *šapparu,* "wild ibex"), a signaling instrument, was fashioned out of an animal's horn; it is also called *qeren hayyôḇēl* (Josh. 6:5) or simply *qeren* (1 Ch. 25:5[?]; Dnl. 3:5-15). As a container, a horn might hold cosmetics (Job 42:14) or oil for anointing (1 S. 16:1,13). Here too we may assume that the notion of power inherent in the horn was more important than its practical utility for such a purpose.

2. *Extended Usage.* In a few cases *qeren* refers to things that are comparable to horns in outward appearance. The projections at the four corners of the altar hearth are called *qarnōṯ hammizbēaḥ,* "horns of the altar" (Ex. 29:12, etc.); here, of course, we are dealing with deliberate reproductions of the horns of animals or gods.[21]

The prophetic parable of the vineyard describes it as located on a "fat-rich *qeren*" (Isa. 5:1), usually interpreted as a "fertile height" (Tg. *ṭwr rm*). But the assumption that "horn" refers to a pointed or prominent hill is open to debate: a Palestinian vineyard did not have to be located on a sunny slope. A simpler explanation would cite the meaning "corner, nook," found in Arabic and Middle Hebrew: the vineyard was located in a favored corner.[22] Appeal to Middle Heb. *qeren,* "capital, principal," is misguided. Jewish commentators interpret "horn" as an allegorical reference to the land of Israel, which surpasses all other lands.[23]

IV. Religious Usage.

1. *Cult.* Since time immemorial, wind instruments have been fashioned from the horns of animals; OT texts often mention such instruments in connection with military or cultic activity, but only once do they use the word *qeren.* In the story of the conquest of Jericho (Josh. 6), we read: "When they make a long blast with the *qeren* of a ram . . ." (v. 5). The redundant syntagm is hard to reconcile with vv. 4,16,20; it may allude to Ex. 19:13, while also associating the collapse of the city walls with the sounding of a mysterious, supernatural horn (cf. 19:13-19). At God's command Samuel fills a container made from a *qeren* with oil, in order to anoint the king chosen by Yahweh (1 S. 16:1,13).

19. → ראם *rᵉ'ēm;* LXX occasionally translates this word as *monokérōtos,* "unicorn," e.g., in Ps. 92:11(10).

20. Cf. Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* 8.3.4 §7.

21. See IV.2 below.

22. Cf. Bab. *Ber.* 17a.

23. Kimchi.

2. *Horns of the Altar.* Instructions in the Priestly Code and in the plan for the new temple in the book of Ezekiel (Ezk. 43:15) require the four corners of the altar hearth to be provided with *qᵉrānôṯ*, of one piece with it. The horns of the sacrificial altar are to be overlaid with bronze, those of the incense altar with gold (Ex. 27:2; 30:2-3; 37:25-26; 38:2). The presence of such altar horns is presupposed by historical narratives from the period of the monarchy (1 K. 1:50-51; 2:28) and is confirmed by archeological evidence.[24] The blood of the sacrificial animals was smeared on the horns of the altar in the course of the various consecratory and expiatory ceremonies (Ex. 29:12; 30:10; Lev. 4:7,18-34; 8:15; 9:9; 16:18; Ezk. 43:20). A festival liturgy envisions tying the sacrificial animal (or the branches carried in procession?[25]) to the horns of the altar (Ps. 118:27).

The origin and significance of the altar horns cannot be determined precisely. The extreme holiness with which they are endowed certainly suggests that they were not merely decorative features,[26] supports for the sacrificial vessels,[27] or reproductions of the horns of the sacrificial animals. Clearly they express the numinous character of the altar itself or of the deity worshiped there. Some scholars have interpreted the horns as rudimentary *massebah*s, which over the course of time came to be located increasingly close to the altar and were finally placed at its corners, symbolizing the divine presence.[28] A later generation saw the horns as symbolizing the concepts of "strength" and "protection" inherent in the word *qeren.*[29] A fugitive would grasp the horns of the altar, gaining the protection of the deity (1 K. 1:50-51). When the horns of the altar are cut off, the altar is desecrated and the sanctuary destroyed (Am. 3:14). The prophet Jeremiah denies the horns of the altar expiatory power: they too are infected with the sin that is engraved on the heart (Jer. 17:1).

3. *Power.* The figurative uses of the word reveal a clear semantic gradation, from the metaphorical associations of an actual animal's horn in the context of a narrative, through the image of a horn by itself charging in all directions, to the abstract concept of "power." Two of the vision sequences recorded in the book of Daniel (Dnl. 7:3-21; 8:3-22) describe horned animals, with certain bizarre details: an animal with ten horns, among which rises a new horn with human eyes and a mouth speaking arrogantly (7:7-8,20-21), and a ram that charges in all directions with its horns until a goat with a conspicuous horn between its eyes breaks the ram's horns off. The goat's great horn is replaced in turn by four horns, one of which grows to blasphemous power (8:3-10). These images refer to the power struggles among the kings of the Medes and the Persians as well as the Hellenistic kings. The horns symbolize their arrogant lust for power (7:17-24; 8:19-22), for which the heavenly court condemns them to powerless destruction (7:11,22,26; 8:25).

---

24. *AOB,* 444, 458-65; Aharoni.
25. See comms.
26. Josephus, *B.J.* 5.5.6.
27. *ANEP,* no. 319.
28. Galling; H. Gressmann, *Die Ausgrabungen in Palästina und das AT* (1908), 28.
29. *AncIsr,* II, 414.

The prophet Ezekiel depicts the powerful and wealthy of Israel, relentlessly pursuing their own advantage, as mighty rams and fat sheep, butting with their horns and pushing aside the weak and hungry members of the flock (Ezk. 34:17-21). The Blessing of Moses extols Joseph as a majestic firstborn bull, goring the peoples with horns like those of a wild ox (Dt. 33:17). In utmost affliction, the psalmist describes the enemy as vicious animals (Ps. 22:17-22[16-21]), and entreats Yahweh for deliverance from the horns of the wild ox (v. 22[21]). When the psalmist's enemies, who are also Yahweh's enemies, are scattered and destroyed, Yahweh exalts the *qeren* of the psalmist like that of a wild ox (92:10-11), restoring vigor and respect. Yahweh will make the horn of daughter Zion iron and her hoofs bronze, that she may beat in pieces many peoples (Mic. 4:13). Whether the prophet is envisioning the image of a threshing ox or a female aurochs (the fem. forms of the verb agree with the subj. "daughter Zion") is unclear. In one of Zechariah's night visions (Zec. 2:2-4[1:19-21]), the nations raise a horn against Judah, to scatter the people; but Yahweh shows the prophet four blacksmiths, who strike down the four horns — probably representing the four points of the compass (2:3-4[1:20-21]). The precise nature of the horns (single or double? associated with an animal?) remains obscure.

The horn as a symbol of power and victory appears primarily in association with the kings of Israel and Judah: God bestows the *qeren* upon the king and exalts it. The origin of this idiom probably lies in symbolic magical rites like those described in 1 K. 22:11-12 (= 2 Ch. 18:10-11): the prophet makes iron horns for the king (the referent of *lô!*) and proclaims in the name of Yahweh that with them he will gore the enemy until they are totally destroyed. Yahweh, who promises an eternal throne to David and his house (Ps. 89:30[29]; 132:11), will cause a horn to sprout up for David (132:17), exalted in the name of Yahweh; through this act of favor, the horn of Israel is exalted (v. 18).[30] The success Yahweh vouchsafes the king is a blessing for the whole nation. Even the prayer placed in the mouth of a grateful mother (1 S. 2:1-10; v. 1: "My horn is exalted by Yahweh") reveals its origins in a royal oracle: Yahweh shatters his adversaries, gives strength to his king, and exalts the horn of his anointed (v. 10).

The religio-historical changes brought about by historical events initiated a process of semantic democratization, giving a *qeren* to the nation as a whole as well to particular individuals, whenever power and victory appeared on the horizon. To Yahweh is due the praise of heaven and earth, because he has raised up a horn for his people (Ps. 148:14) — i.e., he has given them a place of honor on the historical stage. Conversely, a lament over the catastrophe of 587 B.C.E. declares that God has withdrawn his protective hand from Israel and cut down its horn (Lam. 2:3), bringing Israel's proud independence to an end, while exalting the horn of Israel's foes, who gloat over Israel's affliction (v. 17). Later, the prophet Ezekiel comforts the people with the promise that, in the wake of military conflicts among the great powers, Yahweh will cause a horn to sprout up for the house of Israel (Ezk. 29:21) and give it new vigor.

An individual pursued by misfortune lays his horn in the dust (Job 16:15). The

30. On the ambiguity of the verbal form see *BHS*.

wicked, who scoff at divine judgment, lift up their horn on high (Ps. 75:5-6[4-5]); God, however, will cut off all the horns of the wicked, that the horns of the righteous may be exalted (v. 11[10]). For it is the man who fears God and delights in God's commandments (112:1) whose *qeren* will be exalted in honor (v. 9), since ultimately his superior strength will prevail.

A few texts allude to the notion, originally found in Israel as well, that supernatural beings are crowned with horns (Nu. 23:22; 24:8); Moses is so described as he comes down from Sinai with the tablets of the law (Ex. 34:29-35). The verbal root *qrn* used here is usually translated "shine";[31] this translation, however, rests on insufficient evidence: nowhere else does *qrn* have this meaning,[32] and the emphatic statement that it was Moses' skin that appeared in *qeren*-like form suggests horns as the symbol of majestic power. As Jerome says in his commentary on Isa. 5:1, "The horn signifies kingship and power."

The book of Habakkuk concludes with a hymn (Hab. 3). In describing God's majesty v. 4 says: "*qarnayim* are by his side." Here too most translators and commentators find a figurative meaning.[33] But the plethora of mythological motifs in this hymn make it preferable to start with the meaning "horns,"[34] while admitting that beams from the heavenly luminaries were interpreted as horns.

The meaning of the word is totally spiritualized in the cry of the supplicant, "Yahweh . . . is the *qeren* of my salvation" (2 S. 22:3 par. Ps. 18:3[2]), as the associated synonyms show (refuge, shield, stronghold): Yahweh's protection is salvific.

4. *Dead Sea Scrolls*. In the Dead Sea Scrolls the meaning of the word is primarily figurative: in the time of salvation for the people of God, he will go forth with great rage to wage war against his enemies; he will exterminate them and cut off their horn (1QM 1:4). The worshiper thanks God for exalting his horn above all those who denounced him (1QH 7:22); there follows a remarkable juxtaposition of *qeren* and *'ôr*, "light": "You have exalted my horn to the heights, so that I am radiant with sevenfold light" (7:23-24).

In 4Q381 46, a noncanonical psalm, the psalmist (1st person sg.) is given (*ntn*, l. 2) a horn; in ll. 6-7 those who fear Yahweh, who are before him forever, have horns with which they gore *(ngḥ)* many.

11QT 16:2,16; 23:12 speak of smearing blood on the horns of the altar.[35]

Kedar-Kopfstein

---

31. See comms.

32. On Hab. 3:4 see below.

33. Tg. *zyqwqyn;* NRSV "rays" (cf. also Luther); Rashi: beams; K. Elliger, *Habakuk. ATD* XXV (1985), 52: rays; etc.

34. W. F. Albright, "The Psalm of Habakkuk," *Studies in OT Prophecy. FS T. H. Robinson* (New York, 1950), 14.

35. See IV.2 above.

קָרַע *qāra'*; קְרָעִים *qᵉrā'îm*

I. Occurrences and Constructions. II. Tearing Clothing as a Sign of Emotion: 1. OT; 2. Apocrypha and NT. III. Tearing a Garment to Symbolize Loss of Kingship. IV. Tearing Other Objects. V. Figurative Usage. VI. Special Cases. VII. LXX.

I. Occurrences and Constructions. The root *qr'* with the meaning "rend, tear" is found only in Hebrew among the languages of the ancient Near East. The verb does appear in Arabic, but as a rule means "knock, rap, hit, bump."

In the OT *qāra'* appears almost exclusively in the qal and niphal. The only occurrence of the hithpael is dependent on textual emendation (Prov. 27:9). In Post-Biblical Hebrew the piel also appears. The noun *qᵉrā'îm,* "pieces, shreds," appears twice in conjunction with the verb (1 K. 11:30; 2 K. 2:12) and twice by itself (1 K. 11:31; Prov. 23:21).

The majority of the occurrences are in narrative texts, alongside which we may place a few Priestly directives (niphal, Ex. 28:32; 39:23; qal, Lev. 13:56). The root *qr'* is much rarer in prophetic texts, and it appears only three times in wisdom contexts: the verb in Eccl. 3:7, the noun in Prov. 23:21, and the verb again in Prov. 27:9 (emended). Its only occurrence in the Psalter (Ps. 35:15) is textually uncertain.

The verb *qāra'* is generally construed with a direct object; in such cases it usually means "tear." Construction with the prep. *min* gives the meaning "tear off, snatch." The verb is used absolutely in Ps. 35:15 (if the text is in order) and Eccl. 3:7.

II. Tearing Clothing as a Sign of Emotion.

1. *OT.* The vast majority of occurrences of the verb *qāra'* refer to the ritual of tearing one's clothing. It is done as an expression of fear, horror, consternation, or dismay over a calamity that has directly or indirectly affected the person performing the action, or threatens to do so. Conceptually, this association is probably clearest in Jer. 36:24, which speaks of "alarm" *(pḥd)* and the tearing of garments as the expected reaction — an expectation that was not fulfilled. The object torn can be clothing in general *(beged),* a garment *(mad),* a tunic *(kuttōnet),* an overgarment or robe *(mᵉ'îl),* or a cloak *(śimlâ).* As a rule the robe was torn. The texts furnish few details about the actual tear-

---

qāra'. D. Conrad, "Samuel und die Mari-'Propheten,'" *ZDMG Sup* 1 (1969), 273-80; H. J. Elhorst, "Die israelitischen Trauerriten," *FS J. Wellhausen. BZAW* 27 (1914), 115-28; P. Heinisch, *Die Trauergebräuche bei den Israeliten. Biblische Zeitfragen* 13/7-8 (1931); A. Jirku, *Die magische Bedeutung der Kleidung in Israel* (1914); E. Kutsch, "'Trauerbräuche' und 'Selbstminderungsriten' im AT," in K. Lüthi, E. Kutsch, and W. Dantine, *Drei Wiener Antrittsreden. ThS* (1965), 23-42 = his *Kleine Schriften zum AT. BZAW* 168 (1986), 78-95; D. Winton Thomas, "Psalm XXXV.15f.," *JTS* 12 (1961) 50-51; R. de Vaux, *AncIsr,* I, 59; H. Weippert, "Die Ätiologie des Nordreiches und seines Königshauses (I Reg 11,29-40)," *ZAW* 95 (1983) 344-75.

ing: Elisha tears his clothes into two pieces, clearly ripping them in half (2 K. 2:12); the king of Israel tears his clothes so extensively that the onlookers can see that under them he is wearing sackcloth *(śaq)* on his bare body (2 K. 6:30). This description suggests slashing the cloth down to the waist.

Tearing one's robe is often combined with other "rites of mourning and self-humiliation,"[1] including putting on (Gen. 37:34; 2 S. 3:31; 1 K. 21:27; 2 K. 19:1 par. Isa. 37:1; Est. 4:1) or sleeping in *śaq* (1 K. 21:27), covering one's head with dust (*'āpār* or *'ēper,* Josh. 7:6; 2 S. 13:19; Job 2:12) or earth (*'ᵃdāmâ,* 1 S. 4:12; 2 S. 1:2; 15:32), shaving one's head (Job 1:20) or beard (Jer. 41:5), pulling hair from one's head or beard (Ezr. 9:3), gashing one's body (Jer. 41:5), falling (Josh. 7:6; Job 1:20), sitting (Job 2:13) or lying (2 S. 13:31) on the ground, wailing (2 S. 13:19; Est. 4:1), weeping (2 S. 1:12; 2 K. 22:19 par. 2 Ch. 34:27), fasting (2 S. 1:12; 1 K. 21:27), and mourning (*'bl* hithpael, Gen. 37:34; *spd,* 2 S. 1:12; 3:31).

Tearing one's clothing is a reaction to a calamitous event, actual or imminent. It is usually an event that has already taken place. For example, one may tear one's clothing in response to bad news (Gen. 37:34; 2 S. 1:11; 13:31; Job 1:20); but the bearer, too, often comes with torn clothing (1 S. 4:12; 2 S. 1:2; 2 K. 18:37 par. Isa. 36:22; 1 Mc. 5:14). Most often the news concerns the death of a family member (Gen. 37:34; 2 S. 13:31; Job 1:20) or a close associate (2 S. 1:2,11; 3:31); but it can also be news of a terrible defeat in which many Israelites have been killed (Josh. 7:6; 1 S. 4:12; 2 S. 1:2,11).

In all cases the tearing of clothing was an element of mourning, which could be ordered explicitly (2 S. 3:31). A similar explanation probably accounts for the acts of self-humiliation performed by the men from Shechem (Jer. 41:5), obviously in reaction to the catastrophe of Jerusalem in 587. A reversal of political fortunes (2 S. 15:32) or the hopeless prospect facing a besieged city (2 K. 6:30) could also induce people to tear their clothing. The latter text presupposes that the Israelite king was already wearing *śaq* under his outer garment before he tore his clothing, horrified at the dire distress of Samaria, which caused its inhabitants to kill and eat their own children. Wearing *śaq* was obviously an act of penance and self-humiliation occasioned by the plight of the city, whereas tearing his clothing represented a reaction of spontaneous terror.

The same action in 2 S. 13:19 and 2 K. 2:12 is more individualized. Amnon's rape and rejection of Tamar evokes a violent show of grief; Elisha reacts to his separation from Elijah by tearing his clothes in two pieces. Horror at her discovery of the rebellion against her rule evokes the same response on the part of Athaliah (2 K. 11:14 par. 2 Ch. 23:13).

But a prospective disaster can also cause people to tear their clothing. In 2 K. 5:7-8, for example, the king of Israel interprets the letter of the king of Aram as a pretext for war. That his daughter is the first to come out to meet Jephthah means that she will be the sacrifice he has vowed (Jgs. 11:35). The Israelites' determination to return to Egypt (Nu. 14:6 P) threatens to cut short the incipient saving involvement of Yahweh in Israel's history. The practice of mixed marriage, increasingly prevalent in postexilic Je-

1. See Kutsch.

rusalem, raises fears that the nascent Jewish community will go astray (Ezr. 9:3,5). Haman's pogrom edict, of which Mordecai learns, threatens the Jewish community with annihilation (Est. 4:1).

In some cases people tear their clothing in reaction to a disaster threatened by Yahweh. Ahab tears his clothes and undergoes other acts of self-humiliation in response to an oracle of divine judgment spoken by Elijah; as a result Yahweh defers the disaster until the next generation (1 K. 21:27-29). This passage continues the text of v. 20b and explains why the predicted judgment on the Omrides did not take place until after the death of Ahab. Josiah reacts in much the same way when he hears the words of the book of the law, which clearly threaten disaster (2 K. 22:11 par. 2 Ch. 34:19). Jer. 36:24 presents Jehoiakim as the antithesis of Josiah: when the scroll containing Jeremiah's oracles is read before the king, he refuses to react as expected with dismay and self-humiliation, and even seeks to render the ominous words ineffectual by cutting (*qāra'*, v. 23!) the scroll in pieces.

It is impossible to determine with certainty the original meaning of tearing one's clothing. In the context of mourning, it seems probable that the action symbolizes ritual nakedness, a common primitive response to death. But it may also reflect an archaic identification of clothing with the person who wears it, so that tearing a garment represents the rending of the wearer's inmost being.[2] This explanation associates the action with the rites of self-humiliation a person uses to express a sense of diminished humanity, present or imminent. Only rarely does the OT interpret this ritual act, specifically in the passages that describe the reactions of kings Ahab and Josiah to oracles of disaster. Both contexts interpret it as an act of self-humiliation before Yahweh (*kn'* niphal, 1 K. 21:29; 2 K. 22:19 par. 2 Ch. 34:27). The kings thus confess guilt and make amends for it before Yahweh — whether the guilt is personal (Ahab) or that of earlier generations that have ignored the book of the law (Josiah).

2. *Apocrypha and NT.* The practice of tearing one's clothing is also found in the Apocrypha and the NT. Several texts (1 Mc. 2:14; 3:47; 4:39; 11:71) presuppose that this practice was current among the Maccabees and their followers; Jdt. 14:16,19 even assume it among the Assyrians. In 1 Mc. 13:45 the inhabitants of a gentile city tear their clothes as a gesture of self-humiliation before the victorious Hasmonean Simon. In the NT the high priest reacts to Jesus' quotation of Dnl. 7:13 (Mt. 26:65 par. Mk. 14:63) by tearing his clothing; Paul and Barnabas do the same when the people of Lystra mistake them for gods (Acts 14:14).

III. Tearing a Garment to Symbolize Loss of Kingship. Two thematically related complexes associate the tearing of a garment with a predicted loss of kingship. The first complex deals with the reign of Saul (1 S. 15:27-28; 28:17), the second with the reign of Solomon (1 K. 11:11-13,30-31). In 1 S. 15, a chapter probably originating in prophetic circles, Samuel reiterates (cf. 13:7-14) Yahweh's rejection of Saul. Saul ad-

---

2. Jirku, 10.

mits his guilt, but tries to keep Samuel from leaving by grasping the hem of his robe, which tears (*qr'* niphal, v. 27). This causes Samuel to tell Saul that Yahweh will tear (*qr'* qal, v. 28) from him his kingship over Israel. Exegetes have interpreted the tearing of Samuel's robe in a variety of ways, sometimes finding parallels in the language of certain Mari texts.[3] Unlike 1 S. 24:5-6(4-5) *(krt)*, however, this account describes the tearing of Samuel's robe as an accident (niphal!) rather than an intentional act. It provided the catchword that led Samuel to predict the tearing away of Saul's kingship. This prediction is cited again in 28:17.

The texts that associate this same prediction with Solomon's kingship are rooted in a symbolic act performed by Ahijah the Shilonite (1 K. 11:29-39). Ahijah's tearing of his garment into twelves pieces *(qᵉrāʿîm)* symbolizes that Yahweh will tear the kingship from Solomon and give ten tribes to Jeroboam (vv. 30-31). The tearing of a prophet's garment, which was held to be endowed with special power, lends this action greater weight than the parallel in 1 S. 15:27-28, which does not mention the title "prophet." Comparison of 1 K. 11:31 with 1 S. 15:28 and discrepancies between the symbolic act and the first portion of the oracle suggest that the account rests ultimately on an oracle predicting that Yahweh would tear *(qr')* the kingship away from Solomon. After Solomon's death and the division of the kingdom under Rehoboam, this oracle was integrated into the account of Ahijah's symbolic action: to reflect historical events, the "tearing away of the kingship" was reinterpreted as a "tearing of the kingdom into individual tribes," some of which are given to Jeroboam.[4] The related texts, all probably Dtr, depend on 11:31 and its context. This is true of the reference to 11:31 in 14:8, as well as 11:11-13, where Yahweh proleptically announces to Solomon himself the tearing away of the kingship, which Ahijah communicates to Jeroboam in vv. 30ff. by means of his symbolic act and its interpretation. In 2 K. 17:7ff. (Dtr), v. 21 refers once more to this theme. As in the other passages, Yahweh is the subject of the statement; despite the change of subject, this fact argues against emending the qal to a niphal.

IV. Tearing Other Objects. Besides the commonplace of tearing clothing just discussed, the root *qr'* is used to denote the tearing of various other objects. In Ezk. 13:17-23 the prophet is commanded to announce the actions Yahweh will take against the women who have been acting as prophetesses (vv. 20-21): "In daringly anthropomorphic language, the text says that Yahweh himself will tear the magical bands and veils from the hands and heads of the women."[5] Jer. 36:23-24 describes Jehoiakim's outrageous conduct when Jeremiah's scroll is read: the king's cutting off *(qr')* columns of the scroll with a penknife illustrates his hubris. The appropriate reaction would have been to tear *(qr')* his clothes in alarm. The only instance of the root in the Dead Sea Scrolls (CD 12:13) also involves cutting with a knife: fish are to be cut open and bled before being eaten.

---

3. Conrad.

4. For a discussion of the further development of this "etiology of the northern kingdom," see Weippert.

5. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 296.

The Priestly tradition uses *qr'* in two contexts. In the first the priest is to tear off *(qr')* a "leprous" (probably mildewed) piece of fabric if the disease has not spread and the spot has not abated after washing (Lev. 13:56). The second has to do with the robe of the high priest, which is to have an opening for his head fashioned so as not to tear (*qr'* niphal; instructed in Ex. 28:32, carried out in 39:23).

In 1 K. 13:3,5 (clearly secondary additions to an earlier narrative), the niphal of *qr'* also denotes the destruction of the altar at Bethel at the command of a man of God. Eccl. 3:7 treats tearing *(qr')* and sewing *(tpr)* as an antithesis. Prov. 23:21 describes the fate of the drunkard, who will come to poverty and finally be left with only "tatters" for clothing.

V. Figurative Usage. Figurative usage of *qr'* appears in three prophetic texts: Isa. 63:19(64:1); Hos. 13:8; Joel 2:13. Hos. 13:1-8 is an oracle of judgment; vv. 7-8 describe how Yahweh falls upon the apostate Israelites like a wild beast, finally, like a bear robbed of her cubs, tearing open "the covering of their heart." This singular expression "appears to mean the chest, whose ribs protect the heart, the seat of life. When it is 'ripped open,' the person is completely lost. Never before in Hosea has Yahweh pictured himself as such a drastic danger to Israel."[6]

In the midst of the communal lament Isa. 63:15–64:11[Eng. 63:15–64:12] stands a plea for Yahweh to intervene with power (63:19b-64:4[5]), which incorporates imagery from ancient theophany traditions (63:19b-64:2[64:1-2]), including the singular appeal to Yahweh to tear open the heavens and come down to earth (63:19b[64:1]).

The description of the impending day of Yahweh in Joel 2 concludes in vv. 12-14 with a call to repentance, uttered by Yahweh himself as the final chance for deliverance. The elements of a penitential ritual — fasting, weeping, and mourning — are integrated into this call (v. 12). But repentance must go beyond outward observances: "Tear your hearts and not your garments." With this antithesis, which contrasts mere mourning rituals with a transformation involving the entire person, v. 13 interprets the preceding call to return to Yahweh "with a whole heart" (v. 12).

VI. Special Cases. Some texts use *qr'* in an unusual way. Describing Jerusalem as a prostitute who adorns herself in vain to bemuse the advancing enemy, Jer. 4:30 says that she underlines *(qr')* her eyes with paint (the same construction but using the verb *śîm* appears in 2 K. 9:30). The use of *qāra'* here is probably meant to express the idea of opening one's eyes wide (cf. NRSV "enlarges"). There need be no negative nuance of damage to the eyes.[7] Neither is it necessary to postulate a root *qr'* II, "speckle, streak."[8] A similar usage is found in Arabic.[9]

Jer. 22:13ff., a woe oracle against Jehoiakim, refers to the king's building program.

6. H. W. Wolff, *Hosea. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1974), 226.
7. W. L. Holladay, *Jeremiah 1. Herm* (1986), 170.
8. B. Jacob, *ZAW* 22 (1902) 103 n. 1.
9. L. Kopf, *VT* 9 (1959) 273.

In this context *qāra'* in v. 14 refers to the "cutting out" of windows in the process of enlarging the palace.

The text of Prov. 27:9 presents a problem in its second half. It appears to sing the praises of friendship: "Perfume and incense make the heart glad, and the sweetness of a friend *(ûmeṯeq rē'ēhû)* more than aromatic wood[?]."[10] Following the LXX, Frankenberg proposes the reading *ûmiṯqāre'â mē'aṣṣeḇeṯ nāpeš* for v. 9b.[11] This emendation has been accepted by Gemser: "But the soul is torn by trouble."[12] It introduces an otherwise unattested hithpael of *qāra',* but it elucidates so persuasively the clearly corrupt MT that it deserves wider acceptance (cf. NRSV).

On the other hand, *qāra'* in Ps. 35:15 (an individual lament describing persecution by enemies) may well be a textual error. The statement that enemies have been "tearing" the psalmist can be understood in the sense of "tear down" or "disparage." Since, however, the verse and its context present still other textual problems, it is reasonable to consider instead of *qāre'û* the form *qāre'û* ("they cry") or *qāreṣû* ("they wink mockingly") as the original reading.

VII. LXX. The LXX usually translates the qal, as well as the niphal, of *qāra'* with *rhēgnýnai* or *diarrēgnýnai.*

Thiel

10. H. Ringgren, *Sprüche. ATD* XVI/1 (1962), 104; see also G. R. Driver, *ZAW* 55 (1937) 69.
11. W. Frankenberg, *HKAT* I/3,1, 148-49.
12. B. Gemser, *Sprüche Salomos. HAT* XVI (1963), 96.

קַשׁ *qaš;* קשׁשׁ *qšš*

I. Occurrences. II. Meaning. III. Usage: 1. Literal; 2. Figurative. IV. LXX.

I. Occurrences. The noun *qaš,* "straw, stubble," must be considered a primary noun.[1] It is not found outside the domain of Hebrew and Aramaic, so that its use appears to have been restricted to Palestine. Unlike the semantically related terms → מֹץ *mōṣ* and → תֶּבֶן *teḇen,* it has no equivalent in Arabic.[2] The verbal root *qšš* is undoubt-

qaš. G. Gerleman, "Der Sinnbereich 'fest-lose' im Hebräischen," *ZAW* 92 (1980) 404-15.

1. *HAL,* III, 1150; cf. *BLe,* 453w.
2. See also *AuS,* III, 133.

edly derived from this noun;[3] its basic meaning refers to the gathering of straw, extended secondarily to any kind of gleaning.[4]

Besides *qaš,* Aramaic has additional derivatives with similar meaning, such as *qaššā',* "dry straw"; *qᵉšîšîn,* "chaff, blade of grass"; *qᵉšûšôṯ,* "(1) stubble; (2) sprigs."[5]

II. Meaning. Dalman's discussion remains the best description of what *qaš* means in contrast to *mōṣ* and *teḇen,* the other by-products of reaping, threshing, and winnowing.[6] Our word denotes the coarsest residue of stubble, which can be chopped up into straw if necessary for use in making bricks (Ex. 5:12). When a text speaks of burning stubble, it may have in mind a way of fertilizing the soil;[7] more likely, however, it refers to clearing the field, since the process invariably symbolizes destruction.[8] Of the other by-products mentioned above, *teḇen* is clearly the most valuable and useful, *mōṣ* the most worthless; *qaš,* being useful under certain circumstances, occupied a middle position.[9]

III. Usage.

1. *Literal.* In the OT *qaš* appears primarily in figurative usage; only Ex. 5:12 speaks of the order of the Egyptian overseers that the Israelites gather their own stubble *(qaš)* from the fields, to chop it into the finer straw *(teḇen)* needed for making bricks. The same account uses the denominative verb *qšš* (Ex. 5:7,12), which elsewhere serves as a general term meaning "gather": in Nu. 15:32-33 and 1 K. 17:10,12, it refers to gathering sticks; the interpretation of Zeph. 2:1 is uncertain.[10]

2. *Figurative.* Most commonly, prophetic threats of judgment use the image of stubble being devoured[11] by fire:[12] "Therefore, as the tongue of fire devours the stubble, and as dry grass sinks down in the flame . . ." (Isa. 5:24). Various groups are threatened: Isa. 5:24 refers to the wealthy inhabitants of Jerusalem, at whom the prophet hurls seven woes; Isa. 47:14 attacks the astrologers in Babylon; Ob. 18 calls the "house of Jacob" and the "house of Joseph" the fire that will destroy Edom like stubble; Nah. 1:10 uses the image to describe the fall of Nineveh (the relevant idiom is clear despite the difficult text, which probably should be emended); Mal. 3:19(Eng. 4:1) uses the image to describe God's judgment on evildoers. Isa. 33:11 falls into the same category: the text conveys the worthlessness of those addressed: "You conceive chaff, you bring forth stubble"; but once again the judgment upon them is symbolized by the image of

---

3. *GesB,* 733; *HAL,* III, 1154.
4. See III.1 below.
5. *WTM,* IV, 398, 400-401.
6. *AuS,* III, 136-39, fig. 11b.
7. *GesTh,* III/1, 1244.
8. See III.2 below.
9. *AuS,* III, 133.
10. See *HAL,* III, 1155, for the many emendations proposed for this text.
11. → אכל *'āḵal.*
12. → אֵשׁ *'ēš.*

fire devouring the stubble and dry grass (v. 12). Finally, Joel 2:5 likens the voracious locusts to a flame that devours the dry stubble in the field like wildfire.

A different image of judgment is that of the wind[13] scattering chaff: in Jer. 13:24, faithless Jerusalem; in Ps. 83:14(13), the psalmist's enemies (cf. Ps. 1:4). In other texts where *rûaḥ* and *ndp* appear, the notion of judgment is less prominent than the idea of meaninglessness. Isa. 40:24 uses this image to compare the princes *(rôzᵉnîm)* and "rulers of the earth" *(šōpᵉṭê 'ereṣ)* with God the Almighty, who controls the fortunes of the nations; in Isa. 41:2 the prophet uses it to describe the nations and kings destroyed by the "messiah" Cyrus. Job senses his worthlessness before God (Job 13:25) and asks in despair why God still pursues dry chaff *(qaš yāḇēš* par. *'āleh niddap).* Finally, even slingstones and clubs (?) are useless when a hunter wants to tackle a crocodile: "Slingstones turn to chaff before it, it treats clubs like straws" (41:20-21[28-29]).

According to Wis. 3:7, at the last judgment the righteous will shine forth and will run like sparks through the stubble.

IV. LXX. The LXX uses a variety of words to translate *qaš: kalámē* (3 times), *phrýganon* (4 times), *chórtos* (twice). In Isa. 33:11 it paraphrases or interprets the language of the MT by adding a clause: "Vain *(mátaia)* is the strength of your spirit."[14]

Beyse

13. → רוּחַ *rûaḥ.*
14. See III.2 above.

קשׁב *qšb;* קֶשֶׁב *qešeḇ;* קַשָּׁב *qaššāḇ;* קַשֻּׁב *qaššuḇ*

I. General: 1. Statistics; Syntax; 2. Cognates; 3. Basic Meaning. II. Biblical Usage: 1. Human Subjects; 2. God as Subject; 3. The Ear as Subject. III. Ancient Versions and Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. General.

1. *Statistics; Syntax.* The lexicons give the meaning of the Hebrew root *qšb* as "pay attention; attentive; attention"; etc. The verb and the root's nominal derivatives appear 55 times in the MT; there is one additional occurrence in Sir. 3:29 (ms. A).

In Isa. 21:7, after the meaning of the root has already been emphasized by the *figura etymologica (wᵉ)hiqšîḇ qešeḇ,* the expression *raḇ-qāšeḇ* appears redundant as well as

qšb. W. Schottroff, "קשׁב *qšb* hi. aufmerken," *THAT,* II, 684-89.

being syntactically problematic.[1] It is probably the result of a dittography in which (*whqš)yb qšb* was misread as *rb qšb.*[2]

Of the 56 occurrences (including Sir. 3:29), 9 involve nouns or adjectives: the noun *qešeb* occurs 4 times, only in the singular; the adj. *qaššuḇ* occurs 3 times, only in the feminine plural and only modifying *'oznayim,* "ears"; the adj. *qaššāḇ* occurs twice, only in the feminine singular and only modifying *'ōzen,* "ear." Both adjectives are late and are probably artificial formations; they did not enter into the later biblical and postbiblical language.

The verb occurs 46 times in the hiphil and once in the qal; niphal, piel, pual, hithpael, and hophal are not found.

The hiphil occurs absolutely 19 times, plus one additional occurrence in *figura etymologica* with *qešeḇ* as cognate object; in 20 occurrences, therefore, neither the subject made to be attentive nor the object of the attention is mentioned specifically. In a similar number of instances (21), the object of the attention is introduced by a preposition (10 times [including Sir. 3:29] by *l^e^,* 6 times by *'el,* 3 times by *'al,* twice by *b^e^*); in 16 texts the object is impersonal, in 5 personal. Similar prepositional constructions are found with the 5 occurrences of the two adjectives, always with an impersonal object. These prepositions show that *qšb* entails the notion of attention directed at an object, a semantic feature that is present not only when *qšb* is used with a prepositional expression but wherever it appears. Apart from the *figura etymologica* in Isa. 21:7, only in four texts does the hiphil of *qšb* have a direct object specifying what is attended to: Jer. 23:18 (*dāḇār,* "word"); Ps. 17:1 (*rinnâ,* "cry"); 61:2(1), (*t^e^pillâ,* "prayer"); Job 13:6 (*ribbôṯ,* "pleadings"). Only twice is the hiphil of *qšb* followed by the dir. obj. *'ōzen,* "ear" (Ps. 10:17; Prov. 2:2). The possibility of interpreting *'ōzen* here as a second subject ("a person, viz. the ear")[3] can be ruled out: in Prov. 2:2 the par. *nṭh* hiphil with *lēḇ* as its object ("incline one's heart") requires construing *'ōzen* as the object of *qšb* hiphil; the meaning of Ps. 10:17 must be the same. This argument also contradicts the interpretation of the LXX and Vulg., which take *'ōzen* as the (only) subject of *qšb* in Prov. 2:2.

Only in these two passages, then, do we find *qšb* hiphil with a direct object denoting the subject of the action effected. This observation has led some exegetes to conclude that in Ps. 10:17 and Prov. 2:2 *'ōzen* merely refers explicitly to an object (i.e., the subject of the effected action) that is always implicit elsewhere; i.e., they interpret *qšb* hiphil as an elliptical construction omitting the object caused to act. But the textual evidence is insufficient to support so sweeping a conclusion. Furthermore, the syntactic structure of other passages and the likely basic meaning of *qšb* argue against this interpretation.[4] Instead we must interpret *qšb* hiphil as an internally transitive hiphil:[5] the

---

1. JM, §141b.
2. On the confusion of *y* with *r,* see F. Delitzsch, *Die Lese- und Schreibfehler im AT* (Berlin, 1920), no. 109.
3. *GesB,* 732, citing *GK,* §144l,m.
4. See the discussion below, esp. with respect to Prov. 4:20 and 5:1; also I.3 below.
5. *HP,* 47-48, 251-52.

subject of the finite forms of *qšb* hiphil, always a person, is identical with the subject of the effected action.

Only once (Isa. 32:3) is the second person fem. pl. impf. *tqšbnh* pointed as a qal *(tiqšab̲nâ)* rather than the expected hiphil *(taqšēb̲nâ)*. The Vulg., LXX(?), and Tg. translate this form much as they translate the hiphil. One reason for the unusual qal might be that, in contrast to other passages, the subject of the finite verb *qšb* is not a person but the person's "ears," so that an internally transitive hiphil would be difficult. The use of the root in the qal is thus comparable to its use as an attributive hiphil participle in Sir. 3:29 and its use in five passages as a predicate adjective, all six times in conjunction with *'ōzen*. It is also comparable to the two uses of the hiphil with *'ōzen* as direct object.[6]

No forms of the root *qšb* occur in the Pentateuch. In Joshua, Judges, and 1-2 Samuel, there is only once occurrence of the verb, in an aphoristic passage (1 S. 15:22, exhibiting parallelism); otherwise the root does not appear. In 1-2 Kings the noun *qešeb̲* occurs twice (1 K. 18:29; 2 K. 4:31), each time in a series of semantically related expressions. The root is also very rare in the narrative books of the Writings (Ruth, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, 1-2 Chronicles): the two occurrences each of the two adjectives (like the third occurrence of *qaššub̲*, in Ps. 130:2) appear in the context of the late exilic language of prayer (*qaššāb̲*, Neh. 1:6,11; *qaššub̲*, 2 Ch. 6:40; 7:15). The three occurrences of the verb in the narrative books of the Writings likewise appear in the elevated language of prayer (Dnl. 9:19), at the beginning of a solemn address (2 Ch. 20:15), or in an editorial reflection (2 Ch. 33:10). Thus the occurrences of the root are concentrated in prophetic literature (some 40 percent of all occurrences: 8 each in Isaiah and Jeremiah, 2 in Zechariah, 1 each in Hosea, Micah, and Malachi), wisdom literature (some 20 percent of all occurrence: 8 in Proverbs, 2 in Job, 1 each in Song of Songs and Sirach), and the Psalms (almost 20 percent of all occurrences: 9). The root appears almost exclusively in elevated language (parallelism, series, etc.).

Many scholars read a masc. sg. hiphil impv. *hqšb*, "attend," on an ostracon found at Samaria in 1932, dating from shortly before 722 B.C.E.[7] That the OT does not use *qšb* in everyday contexts argues against this reading. In the context of *ś'rh*, "barley" (l. 3), the reading *hqš b(w)*, "the straw in (it)," is preferable.[8] In this case Heb. *qšb* does not occur outside the Bible.

2. *Cognates.* A fragmentary passage in the Aramaic Proverbs of Ahiqar (l. 57) is often reconstructed as: [. . . *'ntm hṣy*]*tw lm* '[*p hqšy*]*b*[*w*] *'ly*.[9] Should this reconstruction be correct, then alongside Aram. *ṣyt*, which the Tg. generally uses to represent Heb. *qšb*,[10]

6. See II.3 below.
7. *KAI*, 188, and pl. XXX; *ANET*³, 321; *DISO*, 267 (all with bibliog.).
8. S. A. Birnbaum in J. W. Crowfoot et al., *Samaria-Sebaste*, III (London, 1957), 12.
9. *AP*, 214; *AOT*, 456: "'Listen and hearken' to me . . ."; *ANET*³, 428: "[Do you lis]ten [and pay attention] to me. . . ."
10. See III below.

we must recognize *haqšîḇû* here as a Hebrew loanword. But a preferable reconstruction is: . . . [*zy tmh*] *'tw: lm* ˈ[*ntm q*]*rb*[*w*] *'ly,* ". . . you, now, draw near to me."[11]

The rare Jewish Aram. *qᵉšaḇ,* "know," "be attentive, watchful,"[12] is probably a Hebrew loanword. There is an OSA *qsb,*[13] but it appears in a fragmentary context and its meaning is uncertain. Many identify it with Heb. *qšb,* but it has also been translated as "commit damage."[14] Any association with Heb. *qšb* is highly unlikely. Any relationship between Heb. *qšb* and the Arab. root *qbś,* "take fire," then "gain knowledge,"[15] remains totally hypothetical. The usual view that the root *qšb* is unattested outside Hebrew is therefore probably correct.[16]

3. *Basic Meaning.* Some earlier scholars believed it possible to posit a concrete basic meaning for *qšb,* such as "stiffen (one's ears)" or "prick up (one's ears)."[17] The actual usage of *qšb* does not confirm such theories.[18]

The frequent association of *qšb* with *'zn* hiphil and *šm',* "hear," as well as its frequent qualification by an object in the realm of speaking and hearing, such as → קול *qôl,* → דבר *dāḇār,* or *'ōzen,* generally lead scholars to posit "hear" as the basic meaning of *qšb.*[19] In this view it differs from the more general terms for "hear" by including the additional nuance of willingness and intentionality.[20]

More likely, however, the internally transitive verb *qšb* denotes an attentiveness antecedent to the distinction between the sensory realms of seeing and hearing.[21] In the only two passages where the noun *qešeb* is used apart from the verb *qšb* (1 K. 18:29; 2 K. 4:31), it has the very general meaning "reaction (to a stimulus)." Otherwise, *qšb* (verb and adjectives) means heightened alertness and attentiveness to something impending, with the express intention of perceiving it completely and comprehensively, being ready and willing to incorporate it into and allow it to determine one's conduct. Of course it is possible to conceive of this orientation as being realized primarily in the phenomenological realm of hearing.

II. Biblical Usage. The subject qualified by the focused attention of *qšb* may be (1) a human person, (2) God, or (3) the "ear" or "ears" of a human being or God. The verb sometimes parallels expressions referring to sight, as well as expressions referring

---

11. F. Rosenthal, *Aramaic Handbook,* I/1 (Wiesbaden, 1967), 16; and others.
12. *WTM,* IV, 395 (synonymous with Aram. *ḥᵃšaḇ,* "think"); Jastrow, 1429.
13. Biella, 461-62.
14. Beeston, 107.
15. L. Kopf, *VT* 8 (1958) 201-11.
16. Schottroff, 684; *KBL*², 858; *HAL,* III, 1151; *GesB,* 731.
17. For the former see F. Delitzsch, *BC* IV/3, 61, with reference to Prov. 2:2; *idem, BC* IV/1, 141-42, with reference to Ps. 10:17. For the latter see *GesTh,* 1242; König, 422.
18. See II below with reference to individual passages, esp. Prov. 4:20 and 5:1.
19. E.g., B. Kedar-Kopfstein, *ZAH* 1 (1988) 53.
20. Schottroff, 685.
21. See II below for a discussion of individual passages, esp. Isa. 21:7 and Prov. 1:24.

to hearing or attention in general; it would be wrong to conclude from contrastive parallels that *qšb* belongs inherently to the domain of hearing.

1. *Human Subjects.* The hiphil of *qšb* is used quite neutrally in Cant. 8:13. In just three texts does it have negative connotations. Hoping to smite him with his own (text emended) words, Jeremiah's enemies pay close attention (*qšb* hiphil) to everything he says (Jer. 18:18). The negative *'al* is deleted, with LXX.[22] An evildoer "attends to (*qšb* hiphil) wicked lips"; a liar listens to (*'zn* hiphil) a mischievous tongue (Prov. 17:4). If a ruler listens to (*qšb* hiphil) falsehood, his officials will be wicked (Prov. 29:12).

In all other passages — the vast majority — the attentiveness signaled by *qšb* is desirable and proper and is therefore commended unreservedly. Three texts use *qšb* for the watchfulness appropriate in the face of a military threat. According to Isa. 21:6-7, "the lookout" *(hammeṣappeh)* is to be posted (cf. v. 8), who is to announce what he sees *(r'h)*. He then sees "riders, horsemen in pairs, riders on donkeys, riders on camels" (cf. v. 9). At the sight of the advancing army, he is to *qšb* (hiphil) *qešeḇ*. The use of *figura etymologica* and the absence of any other object place the entire emphasis on the meaning of *qšb* itself. The "seeing" of an object by the "lookout" precludes associating *qšb* with the realm of hearing; it must be taken in a more general sense: when the army appears the lookout is to "pay close attention and observe carefully."

Isa. 10:28-32 describes the reaction of a string of towns to an advancing army. Among them is Laishah, which "notes with alarm" (v. 30). Like the verbs used with the other place names, *qšb* hiphil was probably chosen here for the sake of assonance.

In Jer. 6:17, in a prophetic metaphor, the call to repent in the face of threatened judgment is presented as a warning cry from "sentinels," who call on the people to heed (*qšb* hiphil) the sound of the trumpet — which they refuse to do.

Without metaphorical dress, the hiphil of *qšb* denotes attention to the prophetic word, demanded but often refused — e.g., a threat of judgment or a call to repent. In Hos. 5:1 the prophet calls on the priests to hear *(šm')*, the house of Israel to give heed (*qšb* hiphil), and the royal house to listen (*'zn* hiphil). In a similar vein Mic. 1:2 calls on all the peoples to hear *(šm')*, and the earth and all that is in it to give heed (*qšb* hiphil). In Isa. 34:1 the nations are to draw near to hear *(šm')*, the peoples to give heed (*qšb* hiphil), and the earth and all that fills it to hear *(šm')*. Each of these passages is followed by a prophecy of judgment. These appeals cannot be traced to forensic usage or the didactic language of wisdom;[23] they are specific to the prophetic genre and communicate in general terms an earnest call for attention.[24]

The hiphil of *qšb* expresses a rejection of the summons to heed a prophetic call to repent in Zec. 1:4 (par. *šm'*) and 7:11 (par. "turn a stubborn shoulder" and "stop the ears"). In Jer. 6:10, in a rhetorical question, Yahweh vainly seeks those who will hear

22. See, e.g., W. L. Holladay, *Jeremiah 1. Herm* (1986), 527.

23. Cf. L. Köhler, *Deuterojesaja stilkritisch untersucht. BZAW* 37 (1923), 111-13: "summons of two witnesses"; H. W. Wolff, *Hosea. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1974), 96: "summons to hear."

24. C. Hardmeier, *Texttheorie und biblische Exegese. BEvT* 79 (1978), 311ff.; H. W. Wolff, *Micah* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1990), 54.

(šmʿ); his subsequent observation that their ears are closed (lit. "uncircumcised") so that they cannot hearken (*qšb* hiphil) implies a call to repent or a prophecy of judgment that will evoke repentance. Isa. 42:23, too, belongs in the context of repentance and future deliverance: the people are to attend *(qšb* hiphil, par. *šmʿ)* to their distress so as to recognize in it Yahweh's reaction to their sin, thus opening the possibility of salvation.

In Isa. 49:1 the hiphil of *qšb* calls attention to a proclamation of future salvation: the servant of Yahweh calls on all the peoples of the world to hear *(šmʿ)* him and pay attention (*qšb* hiphil) to him when he proclaims the all-embracing call that Yahweh has entrusted to him.

In several texts the hiphil of *qšb* refers to active observance of (or refusal to observe) the commandments or instruction of Yahweh: Isa. 48:18 *(miṣwôṯ);* 51:4 (par. with *ʾzn* hiphil, and with *tôrâ* and *mišpāṭ* in v. 4b); Jer. 6:19 (the "words" of Yahweh, par. with rejection [*mʾs*] of Yahweh's *tôrâ*); and Neh. 9:34 (*miṣwôṯ*, par. with failure to keep the *tôrâ* of Yahweh). In 1 S. 15:22 "to obey" and "to heed" (*qšb* hiphil) — clearly referring to Yahweh's will and par. with "hearing the voice" *(šmʿ bᵉqôl)* of Yahweh — are said to please Yahweh more than burnt offerings and sacrifices. Jer. 23:18 asks (rhetorically) what prophet "has stood in the council of Yahweh, so as to heed (*qšb* hiphil) and hear *(šmʿ)* his word" (deleting the second *dᵉḇārô*, with LXX). Here *qšb* hiphil means the attentiveness with which a prophet listens to the words of Yahweh so as to understand them.

In eight passages *qšb* hiphil denotes the attentiveness wisdom instruction requires on the part of the listener (or the listener's "ear"[25]). In Prov. 1:24 wisdom stretches her hand invitingly, but *ʾên maqšîḇ*. Here, as in Isa. 21:7,[26] parallelism with *mʾn* piel ("refuse") and the image of an outstretched hand suggest understanding *qšb* piel not in the sense of "hear" but in a more general sense: "No one heeds."[27] Wisdom teachers and Job use *qšb* hiphil to demand attention and regard for their words: Prov. 4:1; 7:24; Job 13:6; 33:31 par. *šmʿ;* Prov. 4:20; 5:1 par. *nṭh* (hiphil) *ʾōzen*, "incline one's ear." If it were necessary to supply the elliptical obj. *ʾōzen* with *qšb* hiphil, we would hardly expect to find it used as here in parallel with *nṭh* (hiphil) *ʾōzen*.[28]

In Isa. 28:23, too, *qšb* hiphil (par. *šmʿ* and *ʾzn* hiphil) calls for attention to a wisdom discourse.

2. *God as Subject.* Only in one passage is it likely that *qšb* hiphil refers to punitive or judgmental attention on the part of Yahweh: Jer. 8:6. Yahweh is probably the speaker.[29] What he discovers is the refusal of the people to repent; taken by itself, however, his "giving heed" (*qšb* hiphil, par. *šmʿ*) expects their repentance and return.

Everywhere else, *qšb* hiphil with Yahweh as subject refers to his merciful and supportive "attention" and his responsive and favorable "consideration." This holds true also for the six passages where *qšb* (verb or adj.) is associated with Yahweh's

25. See I.3 above.
26. See above.
27. Cf. Kedar-Kopfstein, *ZAH* 1 (1988) 53: synesthesia. See I.3 above.
28. See I.1 and I.3 above.
29. See, e.g., Holladay, *Jeremiah 1*, 276-77, with bibliog.

"ear(s)."[30] The psalmist uses *qšb* hiphil in this sense in appeals and petitions to Yahweh: Ps. 5:3(Eng. 2) (with *'zn* hiphil and *byn*); 17:1 (with *šmʿ* and *'zn* hiphil); 55:3(2) (with *'zn* hiphil, *ḥnn* hithpael, "be merciful," and *ʿnh,* "answer"); 61:2(1) and 66:19 (par. *šmʿ*); 86:6 (par. *'zn* hiphil); 142:7(6) (par. *nṣl* hiphil, "save"). It is used similarly in Dnl. 9:19 (with *šmʿ, slḥ,* "forgive," and *ʿśh,* "act [to help]").

In Jer. 18:18 Jeremiah cites the hostile "attention" (*qšb* hiphil) of his enemies; in v. 19 he uses the same verb in a plea for Yahweh's help: "Give heed to me" *(qšb* hiphil, par. *šmʿ beqôl).* In Mal. 3:16 *qšb* hiphil (par. *šmʿ*) expresses assurance that Yahweh will heed the words of those who fear him.

3. *The Ear as Subject.* The hypothesis of a more general basic meaning, not limited to "hearing," is supported by the nine passages where *qšb* hiphil and qal as well as the adjs. *qaššāḇ* and *qaššuḇ* are associated with *'ōzen* or *'oznayim.* The use of "ear(s)" to qualify the meaning of *qšb,* associating it with the realm of hearing, is more natural if *qšb* does not convey this nuance inherently. The object caused to perform the action — identical with the subject when the hiphil is internally transitive ("oneself") — is specified by *'ōzen* in a kind of metonymy: "cause oneself to be attentive" becomes "cause one's ear to be attentive." Just as the eyes of those who have sight will one day not be closed (Isa. 32:3, emended), so the ears of those who have hearing will be attentive (*qšb* qal). Just as disciples are to incline their hearts *(nṭh* [hiphil] *lēḇ)* to understanding, so they are to make their ears attentive (*qšb* [hiphil] *'ōzen:* Prov. 2:2; cf. Sir. 3:29).

The metonymic use of "ear" for the person who demonstrates the attentiveness denoted by *qšb* is especially common when God or Yahweh is the subject. Just as God's eyes are to be open, so are God's ear(s) to be attentive to hear and heed (*qaššāḇ,* Neh. 1:6,11; *qaššuḇ,* 2 Ch. 6:40; 7:15) the prayers of the petitioner. The psalmist prays that Yahweh's ears will be attentive (*qaššuḇ,* Ps. 130:2) to the supplicant's voice. Yahweh hears the desires of the poor and heeds them, i.e., he makes his ear attentive *(qšb* [hiphil] *'ōzen)* so as to do justice for the orphan and the oppressed (Ps. 10:17-18).

III. Ancient Versions and Dead Sea Scrolls. For approximately one-third of all occurrences of *qšb,* the Tg. of the Prophets uses the pael of *qbl,* "receive, accept." In about two-thirds of the occurrences it uses *ṣwt/ṣyt.* Like Aram. *šmʿ,* this verb is usually translated "hear"; but its basic meaning is "be (favorably) inclined."[31] Aram. *šmʿ* never represents *qšb.*

In about two-thirds of all the occurrences of *qšb,* the LXX translates it with *proséchō(-omai).* Only in about one-sixth of its occurrences do we find simple *akoúō.* Elsewhere we find compounds like *ep-, hyp-, eisakoúō(-omai),* and occasionally *(ep-)akróasis, epḗkoos,* or *enōtízomai.*

The Vg. presents a similar picture: about two-thirds of the occurrences of *qšb* are represented by *in-* or *attendere.* Only in about one-ninth of its occurrences do we find

---

30. See II.3 below.
31. *WTM,* IV, 188.

simple *audire*. Other translations include *auscultare* (5 times), *considerare, contemplari, aspicere, oboedire,* and *erectus.* Thus the ancient versions support the view that the basic meaning of *qšb* is not "hear" but more generally "attend, heed."

In the Qumran texts published to date, *qšb* appears only in CD 20:18-19 (citing Mal. 3:16), 4QDibHam[a] frs. 1-2, 5:21 (alluding to Isa. 48:18), and 4Q381 fr. 85, 2.

Mosis

קָשָׁה *qāšâ;* קָשֶׁה *qāšeh;* קְשִׁי *qᵉšî;* מִקְשֶׁה *miqšeh;* קשח *qšḥ*

I. Etymology. II. Distribution. III. Meaning and Usage: 1. Persons; 2. Objects. IV. Constructions: 1. *ʿōrep̱;* 2. *lēḇ;* 3. *pānîm;* 4. *rûaḥ;* 5. Absolute; 6. *ʿᵃḇōḏâ;* 7. *ʿōl;* 8. Hand; 9. Feminine Adjective. V. Problems. VI. *qšḥ*. VII. Lexical Field. VIII. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Etymology. As a verb, noun, and adjective in the OT, *qāšâ* has the basic meaning "be hard, harsh, cruel."[1] The OT generally uses *qāšâ* in a figurative sense.[2] Besides Biblical and Post-Biblical Hebrew, the root is found in the following languages: various dialects of nonbiblical Aramaic, primarily with a figurative meaning: at Elephantine *my' qšy',* "hard [i.e., swiftly flowing] water, cataract";[3] *mndʿm qš',* "something hard";[4] *ʿm mn 'qšh,* "With whom should I quarrel?";[5] Jewish Aramaic, Christian Palestinian Aramaic, Tg., and Samaritan Aramaic, as the equivalent of the Hebrew root *qāšâ* (it is also used for *pereḵ* in Lev. 25:53);[6] Syriac,[7] Mandaic,[8] and Arab. *qasā,* "merciless, harsh."

---

qāšâ. G. W. Ahlström, "1 Sam. 1,15," *Bibl* 60 (1979) 254; C. H. Chi, "The Concept of 'Hardening the Hard' in the OT, with Special Reference to Is 6" (diss., Singapore, 1974); B. Couroyer, "'Avoir la nuque raide,' ne pas incliner l'oreille," *RB* 88 (1981) 216-25; M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography IX," *Bibl* 52 (1972) 337-56, esp. 350-51; F. Deist, "Zu כְּתֹמֶר מִקְשָׁה in Jer 10,5," *ZAW* 85 (1973) 225-26; G. Gerleman, "Der Sinnbereich 'fest-los(e)' im Hebräischen," *ZAW* 92 (1980) 404-15, esp. 410-14; J. Gray, "A Metaphor from Building in Zephaniah II 1," *VT* 3 (1953) 404-7; M. Greenberg, "The Use of the Ancient Versions for Interpreting the Hebrew Text," *SVT* 29 (1978), 131-48; F. Hesse, *Das Verstockungsproblem im AT. BZAW* 74 (1955), esp. 7-30; R. Schmid, "Heute, wenn ihr auf seine Stimme hört (Ps 95,7)," *FS J. Ziegler. FzB* 2 (1972), 91-96, esp. 95-96; R. R. Wilson, "The Hardening of Pharaoh's Heart," *CBQ* 41 (1979) 18-36; A. S. van der Woude, "קשה *qšh* hart sein," *THAT,* II, 689-92; M. Zipor, "The Deuteronomic Account of the Golden Calf and Its Reverberation in Other Parts of the Book of Deuteronomy," *ZAW* 108 (1996) 20-33.

1. *GesB,* 732.
2. See III below.
3. *AP,* 6.11; 8.8.
4. Ahiqar 101; cf. *DISO,* 267.
5. Ahiqar 140; cf. P. Grelot, *Documents araméens d'Égypte* (1972), 442.
6. See also the passages discussed in V below.
7. *LexSyr,* 703.
8. *MdD,* 416.

II. Distribution. The verbal stems are distributed as follows: five occurrences of the qal, one of the niphal (ptcp., Isa. 8:21), one of the piel (Gen. 35:16),[9] twenty-one of the hiphil, plus two in Sirach (11 times plus once in Sirach with *ʿōrep̱* as obj.; 3 times plus once in Sirach with *lēḇ* as obj.; twice [Ex. 13:15; 2 K. 2:10] *lᵉ* + inf.;[10] once [Gen. 35:17] *bᵉ* + inf. with suf.).

The noun *qᵉšî* is found only in Dt. 9:27.[11] The adj. *qāšeh* occurs 36 times, plus once in Sirach, including 6 times in the phrase *qᵉšēh ʿōrep̱,* once in the phrase *ʿōrep̱ qāšēh,* 6 times in the phrase *ʿᵃḇōḏâ qāšâ,* and 6 times as a feminine (twice pl.) without a noun.[12]

III. Meaning and Usage. The OT uses *qāšâ* with a wide range of meanings, mostly figurative: difficult, rough, severe, cruel, obdurate, obstinate. These nuances are made clear by the context, parallelism, synonyms, and antonyms.[13] A possible exception is Isa. 27:1, which speaks of Yahweh's "hard and great sword."[14]

Even when certain phrases use *qāšâ* only in fixed syntactic formations, these do not determine the meaning.

1. *Persons.* Used with reference to persons,[15] *qāšâ* describes them as "hardened, stubborn, obstinate."

(a) It can characterize their attitude toward others: those who are hard-hearted or stiff-necked[16] will come to grief (Prov. 28:14; 29:1), in contrast to "those who always fear God" (28:14; cf. Sir. 16:14). For example, Nabal is *qāšeh* ("surly") and mean (1 S. 25:3); the sons of Zeruiah are "too violent" for David (2 S. 3:39; cf. also Sir. 8:1: *ʾl tryb ʿm qšh m[mk]*), whereas David is powerless *(raḵ).*[17] Yahweh will deliver Egypt into the hand of a hard master.[18]

(b) In its attitude toward God, Israel is "stiff-necked" (*qᵉšēh ʿōrep̱:* Ex. 32:9, etc.; also Isa. 48:4[19]); it has a "stubborn heart" (Ezk. 3:7, par. with a "hard forehead"): it will listen neither to the prophet nor to God. The descendants are "impudent and stubborn" (Ezk. 2:4).[20] The Israelites are adjured not to be stiff-necked like their ancestors (Dt. 10:16; 2 Ch. 30:8) and not to harden their hearts as at Meribah (Ps. 95:8).

Zedekiah "stiffened his neck and hardened his heart" (2 Ch. 36:13). Pharaoh hard-

9. See III.2.n below.
10. See IV.5 below.
11. See IV.1 below.
12. See IV.9 below.
13. See V below.
14. But see V below.
15. Hesse, 7-14.
16. See IV.1 below.
17. On the "men of Judah" see III.2.d below.
18. Brockelmann, *Synt,* §19c; cf. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1997), 243. D. Hummel, *JBL* 76 (1957) 101, interprets *ʾᵃḏōnîm* as the sg. *ʾāḏôn* with an enclitic *mem.*
19. See IV.1 below.
20. See also IV.3 below.

ened (no dir. obj.[21]), refusing to let Israel go (Ex. 13:15). Job asks rhetorically, "Who could harden [neck, heart, or the like] against him and succeed?" (Job 9:4). This question resembles Prov. 28:14; but, whereas Prov. 28:14 is didactic in intent, Job employs sarcasm to establish the obduracy of Almighty God.

(c) God hardens the heart or spirit of human beings, making them obstinate: e.g., the heart of Pharaoh, who therefore refuses to let Israel go (Ex. 7:3-4; also Sir. 16:15). He hardens the spirit of Sihon (Dt. 2:30, par. with "strengthens his heart"), who in consequence wages war against Israel.[22]

(d) Expressions using *qāšâ* are used to describe the poor, the suffering, and the oppressed. Job feels pity for those whose "days are hard" (Job 30:25). Hannah characterizes herself as *'iššâ qᵉšaṯ-rûaḥ,* "a woman of hard spirit [NRSV 'deeply troubled']" (1 S. 1:15).[23] The niphal ptcp. *niqšeh* (Isa. 8:21, par. with *rā'ēḇ,* "hungry," possibly with *waw explicativum*[24]) may mean "distressed" (NRSV) or "oppressed."[25]

2. *Objects.* Inanimate objects may also be characterized as "hard":

(a) Yahweh has a hard (NRSV "cruel"), great, and strong sword, with which he punishes Leviathan and other monsters (Isa. 27:1).

(b) A "fierce" blast is sent by Yahweh on the day of the east wind (Isa. 27:8; cf. Ex. 14:21, where the east wind is described as *'azzâ*).

(c) A hand can "bear hard" (qal) on someone, such as Yahweh's hand on the Philistines (1 S. 5:7) (cf. *yāqēl 'eṯ-yāḏ* [6:5] and *kāḇēḏ yāḏ* [5:6]) and Israel's hand on King Jabin in Canaan (Jgs. 4:24).

(d) Words can be "hard": the words of the men of Judah were harder (NRSV "fiercer") than those of the men of Israel (2 S. 19:44)[26] (or: "the men of Judah were more stubborn in their words";[27] or: "gained the upper hand"[28]).

(e) Judicial cases *(dᵉḇārîm)* can be "hard," so that they must be brought to Moses to decide (Ex. 18:26); similarly Dt. 1:17: "any *dāḇār* that is too hard *(yiqšeh)* for you," in contrast to *haddāḇār haqqāṭôn,* "a minor case," which is adjudicated by the "officers over thousands," etc.

(f) Any situation may be perceived as hard: "Do not consider it a hardship when you must release your slave" (Dt. 15:18).

(g) A request can be hard or difficult. In the expression *hiqšâ* + infinitive, *hiqšâ* serves the function of an adjective: *hiqšîṯā liš'ôl,* "You have asked a hard thing" (2 K. 2:10).

---

21. See IV.5 below.

22. For a theological discussion, see Hesse, 40-44, 84-95; J. M. Schmidt, "Gedanken zum Verstockungsauftrag Jesajas," *VT* 21 (1971) 68-90.

23. But see *BHS;* also IV.4.b below.

24. E. J. Young, *The Book of Isaiah. NICOT* (3 vols.; repr. 1972), 1:320-21 n. 44; H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1991), 376-77; see also IV.8 below.

25. *HAL,* III, 1152.

26. H. W. Hertzberg, *Samuelbücher. ATD* X (1987), 295.

27. P. K. McCarter, *II Samuel. AB* IX (1984), 414.

28. J. Mauchline, *1 and 2 Samuel. NCBC* (1971), 293-94.

(h) A battle can be "hard" (NRSV "fierce") (2 S. 2:17).

(i) Despots can impose hard labor on the Israelites: the Egyptians (Ex. 1:14; 6:9; Dt. 26:6), Solomon (1 K. 12:4 = 2 Ch. 10:4), the oppressor (Isa. 14:3).

(j) A "hard" (NRSV "heavy") yoke can be a metaphor for heavy labor (1 K. 12:4 = 2 Ch. 10:4).[29]

(k) According to Gerleman, "hard" passion *(qin'â)* is as "powerful" as Sheol (Cant. 8:6, par. "love is *'azzâ* as death").[30]

(l) The wrath of Simeon and Levi is "hard" (Gen. 49:7, par. "their anger is *'az*";[31] cf. also Am. 1:11).

(m) "Hard" ways (Jgs. 2:19) probably means "stubborn behavior"; the expression may interpreted as an elliptical clause.[32]

(n) The only occurrence of the piel (Gen. 35:16, *watt^eqaš b^eliḏtâ)* probably refers to a "difficult birth." Because the Sam. text reads *wtqšh,* probably representing a niphal,[33] and v. 17 uses the hiphil *b^ehaqšōṯâ,* many propose reading the hiphil *watteqeš* in v. 16 instead of the piel.[34] Old Canaanite usage has been cited against this proposal.[35]

IV. Constructions. In a variety of constructions *qāšâ* has the meaning "be(come) rebellious," primarily against God, or, with Yahweh as subject, "make rebellious."

1. *'ōrep̱.* The combination *qāšeh* + *'ārep̱,* "stiff-necked, stubborn," characterized people who refuse to attend or yield.[36] The phrase *q^ešēh 'ōrep̱* occurs 6 times, always modifying *'am.* All its occurrences are in Exodus and Deuteronomy, in the context of the golden calf (Ex. 32:9; 33:3,5; 34:9; Dt. 9:6,13); it serves as an epithet for Israel. The expression "the stubbornness *(q^ešî)* of this people" (Dt. 9:27) may be an elliptical form of *q^ešî 'orpô* (cf. the diacope of the phrase in Isa. 48:4: "You are hard [*qāšeh*] and your neck is an iron sinew and your forehead bronze"). The expression "your rebelliousness *(m^erî)* and your stubbornness *('ōrep̱ qāšeh)*" in Moses' farewell discourse (Dt. 31:27) refers back to his discourse in 9:4ff.; and *hiqšâ* appears with Israel's *'ōrep̱* as object (2 K. 17:14; Jer. 7:26; 17:23; 19:15; Neh. 9:16-17,29). Israel is adjured not to be stubborn any longer (Dt. 10:16; 2 Ch. 30:8).

2. *lēḇ.* The expression *q^ešê lēḇ* or *hiqšâ lēḇ* describes the house of Israel when it refuses to listen to Yahweh (Ezk. 3:7, par. "have a hard forehead"). The Israelites must not harden their hearts, as at Meribah (Ps. 95:8); this metaphor may derive from Dt.

---

29. See IV.7.

30. P. 412.

31. Cf. C. Westermann, *Genesis 37–50* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1986), 218: "their anger, for it was fierce" par. "their wrath, for it was cruel."

32. Hesse, 14; van der Woude, 691.

33. *LOT,* III/1, 386.

34. *GK,* §48g; *BHK; BHS.*

35. J. A. Soggin, *VT* 11 (1961) 432; see also *HP,* 91.

36. → ערף *'ōrep̱* III.4.

10:16 in its context.[37] The phrase *maqšeh libbô* (Prov. 28:14) is similar. These expressions refer to human beings who harden their hearts. In Ex. 7:3 it is God who hardens the heart of Pharaoh.

3. *pānîm.* The phrase *q^ešê pānîm,* "of defiant countenance," occurs only in Ezk. 2:4, par. *ḥizqê lēḇ.* Since this clause does not appear in LXX^B, many consider it a gloss "quoted" from 3:7[38] or "free variations of the formulations of 3:7-8."[39] Greenberg, however, compares it with other metaphors using *pānîm* (Isa. 50:7; Jer. 5:3; Ex. 20:20) and arrives at the conclusion that this epithet for Israel here replaces the usual "stiff-necked" with a new connotation: impassive, having a face that shows no emotion.[40]

4. *rûaḥ.* Various nuances are conveyed by *qāšâ* when used with *rûaḥ.* (a) In Dt. 2:30 the statement "Yahweh hardened *(hiqšâ)* his spirit" (i.e., made him [Sihon] obdurate), par. *'immēṣ 'eṯ-l^eḇāḇô,* has the same meaning as "he hardened the heart of Pharaoh" (cf. Ex. 7:3). (b) In 1 S. 1:15, where Hannah refers to herself as an *'iššâ q^ešaṯ-rûaḥ,* the meaning "stiff-necked" hardly fits the context.[41] Many therefore prefer the LXX reading: *hḗ sklērá hēméra,* "woman of hard days" (cf. Job 30:25), i.e., someone who has gone through a difficult time, days of misfortune;[42] in a similar vein Stoebe speaks of a "desperate woman."[43] Ackroyd prefers the meaning "I am sober," in response to Eli's insinuation that Hannah is drunk (v. 14).[44] Ahlström interprets the phrase as meaning "determined, persistent," Gerleman as "steadfast," and Loretz as "strong-minded, able."[45]

5. *Absolute.* The use of *hiqšâ* without an object (e.g., Ex. 13:15; Job 9:4[46]) is generally considered an elliptical construction, with the obj. "neck," "heart," "or "spirit" to be supplied. But it is also possible that *hiqšâ* may be used intransitively: cf. *'m mn 'qšh,* "With whom should I quarrel?"[47] The expression "their [Israel's] hard way" *(darkām haqqāšâ,* Jgs. 2:19) is also elliptical, denoting "the way (of life) that results from their obstinacy."[48]

6. *'^aḇōḏâ.* The combination *qāšeh* + *'^aḇōḏâ* means "hard labor."[49]

---

37. Schmid, 95-96.
38. G. Fohrer, *Ezechiel. HAT* XIII (1955), 15; W. Eichrodt, *Hesekiel. ATD* XXII/1 (1996), 9.
39. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 90.
40. Pp. 135ff.
41. Contra S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel* (Oxford, ^{2}1913), 14.
42. *BHK.*
43. *Erste Buch Samuels. KAT* VIII/1 (1973), 91; cf. Vg.
44. P. R. Ackroyd, *CBC.*
45. Ahlström; Gerleman, 411; Loretz, *BZ* 3 (1959) 293-94.
46. See III.1.b above.
47. Ahiqar 140; *HP,* 97.
48. Hesse, 14; van der Woude, 691.
49. See III.2.i above.

7. *ʿōl.* The use of *ʿōl* as the object of *hiqšâ* (1 K. 12:4 = 2 Ch. 10:4) (in contrast to *qll* hiphil), "make a yoke heavy," has not gone unchallenged: Noth observes that *qāšeh,* "hard," is inappropriate as a qualifier of *ʿōl;*[50] in the context we would expect *kāḇēḏ,* "heavy," which actually occurs in a similar clause (1 K. 12:10,14 = 2 Ch. 10:10,14); cf. also the use of *kāḇēḏ* with *ʿōl* in 1 K. 12:4,11 = 2 Ch. 10:4,11. Noth therefore interprets *ʿōl* as "burden." In 1 K. 12:4 LXX^{BA} represent *hiqšâ,* like *hiḵbîḏ,* with *ebárynen,* whereas elsewhere *qāšâ* is represented by *sklēr-.*

8. *Hand.* A hand may "bear hard" *(qāšâ)* on *(ʿal)* someone.[51] The hapax legomenon *niqšeh* in Isa. 8:21, "oppressed," may represent the passive sense of the corresponding expression.

9. *Feminine Adjective.* We also find *qāšâ* as a feminine adjective without any noun.

(a) The words *hirʾîṯā ʿammᵉḵā qāšâ* (Ps. 60:5[Eng. 3]) mean "you have made your people see hard things." The proposed emendation *hirwêṯā,* "you have satiated," is based on the par. *hišqîṯâ,* "you have made to drink," in v. 5b(3b).[52] Another proposal is *hōrēʾṯā,* "you made to drain the cup," from *yrʾ* II, "drink deeply."[53]

(b) In the statement "I am sent to you *qāšâ*" (1 K. 14:6: Ahijah to Jeroboam's wife), *qāšâ* refers not to the form ("hard words") but to the content of the message.[54]

(c) But *qāšâ* can also refer to form: Saul may answer Jonathan harshly (1 S. 20:10); Rehoboam answers the people harshly (1 K. 12:13 = 2 Ch. 10:13).

(d) The fem. pl. adj. *qāšôṯ* functions as a neuter with adverbial force: "speak harshly" (Gen. 42:7,30: Joseph to his brothers), "without familiarity or personal involvement."[55] Cf. *ʿānâ ʿazzôṯ* in contrast to *dibber taḥᵃnûnîm*[56] and *dibber rakkôṯ* (Job 40:27[41:3]) par. *taḥᵃnûnîm.*

V. Problems. The word *miqšâ,* "cucumber field," in Isa. 1:8 and Jer. 10:5 is related to **qiššūʾâ* (Nu. 11:5); like *miqšeh,* "well-set hair" (Isa. 3:24), it derives from *qšh* II.[57] Gerleman derives *miqšâ* in Jer. 10:5 from *qšh* I, "rigid": "rigid structure" (cf. the versions, which translate it as "hammered iron," similarly to Ex. 25:18, etc.).[58]

With respect to the cherubim (Ex. 25:18; 37:7), the lampstand (25:31,36; 37:17,22; Nu. 8:4), and the trumpets (Nu. 10:2; also Sir. 50:16), the translations vary: "wrought, hammered metalwork" (from *qšh* II),[59] "hammered work"[60] (cf. *ngydʾ* in Tgs.), or "of

50. M. Noth, *Könige. BK* IX/1 (1983), 273.
51. See III.2.c above.
52. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1989), 1,4.
53. M. Dahood, *Psalms II. AB* XVII (1968), 78.
54. Brockelmann, *Synt,* §93n.
55. Gerleman, p. 412; cf. *GK,* §122q.
56. See VII.4 below.
57. *HAL,* II, 629.
58. Pp. 413-14.
59. *HAL,* III, 629.
60. B. S. Childs, *Exodus. OTL* (1974), 513; M. Noth, *Numbers. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1968), *in loc.*

one piece" (from *qšh* I).[61] The last is the interpretation of the talmudic and medieval Jewish scholars, and comports best with *miqšâ 'aḥaṯ* (Ex. 25:36; 37:22).

The meaning of *hiṯqōšᵉšû* (hithpael) *wāqôššû* in Zeph. 2:1 is unclear; most identify it with *qšš* rather than *qāšâ* I.[62] But Gray translates: "Harden yourselves and stand firm"; Gerleman's rendering is similar: "Be sober and become sober."[63]

VI. *qšḥ*. The root *qšḥ* is related to *qāšâ* semantically and perhaps also etymologically (cf. the Arab. verb *qasaḥa*, "be hard," and the OSA noun *qśḥ*, "harshness, violence"[64]). The verb occurs only twice in the OT, both times in the hiphil: (a) with *lēḇ* as object: "You [Yahweh] harden our heart, so that we do not fear you" (Isa. 63:17; cf. *qšh* + *lēḇ* in Ex. 7:3); (b) without an object:[65] "It [the ostrich] makes its young hard" or "It deals cruelly with its young" (Job 39:16). There is one more occurrence of the verb in Sir. 30:12 (+ *wmrh bk;* the text uses the ambiguous form *wyšqh*).

VII. Lexical Field. Several terms function as synonyms of *qāšâ;* they may appear in parallel in the same clause, in similar constructions,[66] or in identical contexts. (1) → אמץ *'āmaṣ* + *lēḇ:* Yahweh hardens the heart of Sihon (Dt. 2:30, par. *hiqšâ 'eṯ-rûḥô*); Zedekiah hardened his heart (2 Ch. 36:13, par. *hiqšâ 'orpô*). (2) → חזק *ḥzq:* with *lēḇ* par. *qᵉšê pānîm* (Ezk. 2:4), with *pānîm* (Jer. 5:3), with *mēṣaḥ* par. *qᵉšê lēḇ* (Ezk. 3:7), and with *yāḏ 'al* (Ezk. 3:14).[67] (3) → כבד *kāḇēḏ:* with *lēḇ* (Ex. 7:13, etc.); both *qšh* and *kbd* appear with the same meaning as attributes of the nouns *milḥāmâ* and *'ᵃḇôḏâ.* (4) → עז *'z:* par. *qāšâ* (Gen. 49:7; Cant. 8:6; cf. also Jgs. 3:10; Prov. 18:23). Antonyms of *qāšâ* include *qll,*[68] *rkk,*[69] and *qṭn.*[70]

VIII. Dead Sea Scrolls. In the Dead Sea Scrolls we find the following expressions using *qāšâ/qāšeh: 'wrp qšh* (1QH fr. 12:4; 1QS 5:5 [with *lmwl 'wrlt yṣr;* cf. Dt. 10:16]); *qšy 'wrp* (1QS 6:25); *'šr yqšw 't 'wrpm* (4Q182 1:2-3); *qšw b'wrpm* (4Q504 4:7); the unusual *lbb qwšy* (1QM 14:7),[71] par. *qwyy rš'h;* and *[qw]šy lbb* (4Q497 1:4)

Zipor

---

61. Gerleman, 412-13.
62. W. Rudolph, *Zephanja. KAT* XIII/3 (1975), 271; *HAL,* III, 1155.
63. Gray, 407; Gerleman, 414.
64. Beeston, 108.
65. See IV.5 above.
66. See IV.9 above.
67. See III.2.c and IV.8 above.
68. See IV.7 above.
69. See III.1.a and IV.9.d above.
70. See III.2.e above.
71. See Y. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness* (Eng. trans. Oxford, 1962), 326-27; C.-H. Hunzinger, *ZAW* 69 (1957) 138-39.

קָשַׁר qāšar; קֶשֶׁר qešer; קִשֻּׁרִים qiššurîm

I. 1. Occurrences, Basic Meaning, Etymology; 2. LXX. II. Meaning: 1. Bind; 2. Conspire. III. Sirach.

I. 1. *Occurrences, Basic Meaning, Etymology.* The word group *qāšar* occurs a total of 60 times in the OT (only in Hebrew). The verb appears 36 times in the qal (with the possible addition of the conjectural emendation in Jer. 12:6[1]), twice each in the niphal and piel, once in the pual, and 3 times in the hithpael (a hiphil has been conjectured in Isa. 8:13-14[2]). There are two derived nouns, *qešer* and *qiššurîm.* The former occurs 14 times (emending the corrupt text of Ezk. 22:25 on the basis of LXX[3]), the latter twice (plus a possible cj. in Job 8:14[4]). An additional derived noun *miqšār* has been conjectured in Isa. 8:14.[5] There are 5 additional occurrences of the word group in Sirach, 2 of the verb in qal and 3 of *qešer* (although the latter in 41:18 is uncertain[6]).

The basic meaning is "bind (on)." This is the meaning conveyed by the verb in 13 occurrences of the qal, as well as by the niphal (pass. or reflexive), the piel (resultative[7]), and the noun *qiššurîm.*[8] In the majority of occurrences, however, the stative sense "be associated" is determinative, always understood as an association of persons engaged in a conspiracy, so that the root comes to mean "conspire." This is true for the majority of occurrences of the qal, as well as for the hithpael (with effectively the same meaning as the qal) and for the noun *qešer.*[9]

Besides the OT, the word group is found in Middle Hebrew and hence in Jewish Aramaic; here, however, it generally conveys only the transitive meaning "bind" (even in the case of the noun *qešer*[10]). Here belong also two Hebrew occurrences in the Dead Sea Scrolls. There are no immediate analogues in other Semitic languages. The as-

---

qāšar. P. R. Ackroyd, "The Verb Love — *'āhēb* in the David-Jonathan Narratives — A Footnote," *VT* 25 (1975) 213-14; G. R. Driver, "Two Misunderstood Passages of the OT," *JTS* 6 (1955) 82-87; C. A. Evans, "An Interpretation of Isa 8,11-15 Unemended," *ZAW* 97 (1985) 122-23; E. E. Platt, "Jewelry of Bible Times and the Catalog of Isa 3:18-23," *AUSS* 17 (1979) 71-84, 189-210.

1. See II.2 below.
2. See II.2 below.
3. See *BHS.*
4. See II.1 below.
5. See II.2 below.
6. See III below.
7. *HP,* 189.
8. The meaning of this noun is discussed in II.1 below.
9. See II.2 below for a discussion of the special meaning Driver postulates for the noun in Isa. 8:12-14.
10. Jastrow, 1432.

sumption of a relationship with Akk. *kašāru(m)/kešer,* "restore,"[11] is highly dubious. But the root is probably related to → קצר I *qāṣar,* with parallels in other Semitic languages.

There is a highly uncertain inscriptional occurrence in Lachish ostracon 5.[12] The qal passive participle and the pual participle in Gen. 30:41-42 present a problem. The context suggests the meaning "strong," but such a meaning is hard to reconcile with the stated basic meaning of *qāšar.*[13] We should probably think in terms of derivation from a different root, possibly related to Arab. *qaswarat,* "strong, powerful," from *qasara,* "force, compel."[14]

2. *LXX.* Except in Gen. 44:30 and Prov. 7:3, the LXX uses *deín* and its compounds as well as *apháptein (exáptein)* to represent the qal of the verb with the meaning "bind." For the meaning "conspire," it usually uses *systréphesthai* (in Am. 7:10 a construction with *systrophḗ,* in 2 Chronicles always *epitíthesthai,* in 1 K. 15:27 *perikathízein,* in 2 K. 12:21 *deín,* and elsewhere still other verbs meaning "come together"). In Gen. 30:42 *epísēmos* represents the qal passive participle. For the piel we find *peritíthesthai* in Isa. 49:18 and *syniénai desmón* in Job 38:31; for the hithpael we find *systréphesthai* in 2 K. 9:14 and *epitíthesthai* in 2 Ch. 24:25-26. There are no LXX equivalents for the niphal and pual (late recensions have *syndeísthai* for the niphal in 1 S. 18:1). The usual equivalents for *qešer* are *sýndesmos* and *sýstremma; systrophḗ* and *sýnapsis* occur once each; in 2 Ch. 23:13 we find *epitíthesthai,* in 2 Ch. 25:27 *epíthesis,* in 2 K. 17:4 *adikía,* and in Isa. 8:12 *sklērós.*[15] In Jer. 2:32 *qiššurîm* is represented by *stēthodesmís;* it has no direct equivalent in Isa. 3:20. In the book of Sirach the verb is represented by *katadesmeúein* in 7:8 and *qešer* by *mṓmos;* the *figura etymologica* in 13:12 is translated freely with *kákōsis* and *desmós* (pl.).[16]

II. Meaning.

1. *Bind.* When it has the transitive meaning "bind," the verb is associated in the first instance with concrete objects. A thread or cord is bound on something to make it recognizable (Gen. 38:28; Josh. 2:18,21). The city wall of Jerusalem is joined together (by interlocking stone, Neh. 3:38[Eng. 4:6], niphal). This meaning can also have theological import. As a symbolic act Jeremiah is to tie a stone to a scroll and throw it into the Euphrates to prophesy the fall of Babylon (Jer. 51:63; cf. v. 64). The texts in the book of Job serve to demonstrate the infinite greatness of God's creative power in contrast to the limitations imposed on human actions. Unlike God, no human being is able to bind (piel) the chains of the Pleiades to keep them in their place (38:31)[17] or tie Leviathan

---

11. *CAD,* K, 284-86; *AHw,* I, 461-62; cf. *GesB,* 732; *HAL,* III, 1153.
12. *DISO,* 268; *KAI,* no. 195.
13. *GesB,* 733: "be firmly bound" = "be taut, strong."
14. Lane, 7:2522; also *GesB,* 732-33; cf. *KBL*³, 1076.
15. See I.1 above for Ezk. 22:25.
16. For a discussion of 41:18 see III below.
17. → כוכב *kôḵāḇ* II.1; for a different interpretation see G. Fohrer, *Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 507.

on a leash like a child's pet (Job 40:29[41:5]; cf. God's playing with Leviathan in Ps. 104:26).[18] Nor can a human tie a wild ox to a rope and use it for plowing (Job 39:10). In the prophetic promise recorded in Isa. 49:18, the ornaments that a bride binds on (piel)[19] symbolize the honor and glory of Zion in the coming time of salvation, after the exiles return.

An abstract noun may be the object of the verb when used figuratively. For example, the Israelites are to bind the commandments[20] of Deuteronomy on their hands as signs of remembrance[21] (Dt. 6:8; 11:18) — i.e., the commandments are to be constantly present to Israel as a precious and inalienable possession. We find a similar image in Prov. 3:3; 6:21; 7:3, here with reference to the instructions and commandments of parents and wisdom teachers (cf. 3:1 [to which v. 3a refers, v. 3a probably being a secondary addition[22]]; 6:20; 7:1-2).[23] Prov. 6:21a (in contrast to v. 21b) speaks not concretely of a part of the body to which ornaments are commonly bound but abstractly of the *lēḇ* as the core of the human person,[24] thus making clear that the end in view is inward assimilation of instruction. Conversely, 22:15 states that folly *('iwweleṯ)*[25] is bound up in the heart of a boy — i.e., it is a fundamental constituent of his nature. Finally, when the text states that the *nep̱eš* of one human being is bound up with that of another (Gen. 44:30; 1 S. 18:1 [niphal]), it also envisions a tie emerging from within and embracing the entire being of both; in this context *nep̱eš* suggests primarily the element of desire that is characteristic of human beings.[26] (In 1 S. 18:1 the meaning "conspire" may also stand in the background, as a proleptic literary allusion to 22:8,13.)[27]

The niphal participle in CD 13:19 also has to do with the binding of human beings, in this case members of the Qumran community; but the fragmentary state of the text prevents a clear understanding of the nature of the binding.

The basic meaning "bind" is probably reflected also in the noun *qiššurîm,* which denotes some kind of adornment for a woman, especially a bride, that was probably tied on (Isa. 3:20; Jer. 2:32). Possibly it refers to breast bands (so interpreted by LXX in Jer. 2:32).[28] In Job 8:14 the emendation *qiššurê qayiṭ,* "summer threads," has been proposed.[29] The noun *qešer* in CD 13:10 also deserves mention in this context; there (as in Middle Hebrew[30]) it has the meaning "bond, fetter," and is used as a metaphor for social coercion and oppression.

---

18. לויתן *liwyāṯān.*
19. On *ʿᵃḏî* see → עדה *ʿāḏâ* IV.2.
20. On *dᵉḇārîm* (6:6; 11:18) → דבר *dāḇar* V.5.b.
21. → אות *ʾôṯ* III.2.d.
22. O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos. BK* XVII (1983), 32-33.
23. → אמר *ʾāmar* IV.2 *(ʾēmer);* → מצוה *miṣwâ* III.7; → תורה *tôrâ.*
24. → לב *lēḇ* V.
25. → אויל *ʾᵉwîl.*
26. → נפש *nep̱eš* IV.2.
27. Ackroyd; see II.2 below.
28. See I.2 above; also Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1991), 152.
29. *BHS; HAL,* III, 1154; see F. Horst, *Hiob. BK* XVI/1 (1983), 126, 133.
30. See I.1 above.

2. *Conspire.* When the verb and the noun *qešer* reflect the stative meaning "be bound," they refer primarily to persons bound in a conspiracy, with the goal of deposing and slaying the reigning king and usurping the empty throne. Used in this sense, the word group appears mostly in the books of Kings together with the parallel texts in 2 Chronicles, since these are the texts that speak most frequently of such occasions. Successful attempts to usurp power, always associated with a change of dynasty and therefore entailing not just the slaying of the king himself but also the eradication of his entire family, are attested particularly for the northern kingdom. In the relevant texts the usurper himself, as the protagonist, is always the subject of the verb (1 K. 15:27; 16:9,16,20; 2 K. 9:14 [hithpael]; 10:9; 15:10,15,25,30; with *qešer* in *figura etymologica:* 1 K. 16:20; 2 K. 15:15,30).[31]

For the southern kingdom the text records only times when the king was slain but the coup as a whole was unsuccessful. In these instances the verb always has a plural subject. When the subject is explicit, it is the *ʿᵃḇāḏîm* of the slain king,[32] who are themselves finally killed (2 K. 12:21[20; cf. 14:5]; 21:23-24 par. 2 Ch. 24:25-26 [hithpael; cf. 25:3]; 33:24-25). The *ʿᵃḇāḏîm* were probably also involved in the conspiracy mentioned in 2 K. 14:19 (par. 2 Ch. 25:27); we may assume that its failure, implicit in v. 21 (2 Ch. 26:1), meant that they suffered the same consequences. In 2 K. 12:21(20); 14:19; 2 Ch. 25:27, we find *figura etymologica* with *qešer.* In all these instances the actual goal of the conspiracy remains unclear: the overthrow of the Davidic dynasty itself or just the enthronement of a different Davidide. In each case, however, the subject of the verb is plural, so that the attempted coup is depicted as a purely collective act; from this observation we may conclude that none of the conspirators expected to usurp the throne himself. At least the present texts suggest such an interpretation; the same is probably true in the case of those named in 2 K. 12:22(21), itself a secondary addition. The second possibility quite clearly holds true for the undertaking described in 2 K. 11 (2 Ch. 22:10–23:21), which is successful: at its conclusion a new Davidide is enthroned. In this case, however, the purpose of the coup is to remove a usurper in order to restore the earlier dynasty; there the usurper herself describes the coup as a *qešer* (2 K. 11:14; 2 Ch. 23:13).

Outside the books of Kings and Chronicles, only two passages use the word group to describe a conspiracy against the reigning king. The first is Absalom's attempted usurpation, for which he quickly gained so many supporters that the text can speak of a conspiracy involving the whole population (2 S. 15:12b); here the noun *qešer* denotes popular conspiracy. Its significance is further underlined by the adherence of so experienced a counselor as Ahithophel (v. 31; cf. v. 12a; 16:23). The other instance is a conspiracy aimed at the overthrow of Saul and the usurpation of his throne by David, involving both Jonathan and the priests of Nob (1 S. 22:8,13; cf. v. 7). According to the present text, however, this conspiracy was only a fantasy rooted in Saul's suspicious nature.

---

31. For a discussion of the slaying of the king and his family → נכה *nkh* II.2.b.
32. On their title and function → עבד *ʿāḇaḏ* III.5.

Other passages use the word group in a modified or figurative sense. The charge that Amos has been conspiring (Am. 7:10) does not mean that he has been an active participant in a conspiracy but that his (public) message (v. 11) has the same effect as the subversive activity of genuine conspirators. Neh. 4:2(8) refers to the formation of a coalition by the opponents of rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem (v. 1[7]) as a conspiracy. More precisely, however, the goal was only to prevent the building of the wall by means of a secretly planned ambush (v. 5[11]). The text uses the verb *qāšar* to make very clear the danger and perfidy of this design. The verb is probably also intended to stigmatize the design as a subversive act against the sovereignty of the Persian Empire and against Nehemiah as the representative of royal authority.[33]

A subversive alliance with Egypt to support Israel's treachery against the Assyrian emperor is recorded in 2 K. 17:4. Although this alliance is not intended to dethrone the emperor, it endangers the totality of the empire embodied in his person and is therefore treated as a personal attack. Jer. 11:9 applies the same idea to Israel in a theological statement of Israel's treachery against Yahweh (cf. v. 10b), here interpreted as an internal situation within Israel. The attack on a prophet characterized by 2 Ch. 24:21 as a conspiracy is likewise ultimately directed against Yahweh (v. 19) and is therefore condemned above all as a sign of apostasy from him.

That the prophet Jeremiah sees himself as the target of a conspiracy is clear from Jer. 12:6, if the text is emended in this sense.[34] The problem of textual emendation also arises in Isa. 8:12-14. In v. 12 *qešer* probably refers to the planned coup mentioned in 7:5-6, in the context of the Syro-Ephraimite War (Evans's theory that it reflects the people's judgment of Isaiah's appearance in 7:1ff. is highly unlikely). The noun refers either to the designs of the allies themselves, a sense similar to that in Neh. 4:2(8), or, more likely, to a coup plotted by a circle of conspirators in Jerusalem to advance the interests of allies.[35] The parallelism in vocabulary between vv. 12b and 13b suggests that originally the word group *qāšar* was represented in v. 13a, parallel to 12a, and that *taqdîšû* should be viewed as either a corruption or a later correction of a hiphil of the verb ("view as a conspirator").[36] In other words, the people should not fear the putative conspiracy spoken of in v. 12a; they should fear Yahweh, who acts like a conspirator against his people. In this case the word *miqdāš* in v. 14a should be replaced by a hiphil participle of the verb ("conspirator") or by the noun **miqšār* ("conspiracy").[37] The question remains, however, whether the text of v. 13a should not be left as it stands. The passage would then mean that the people should not fear the conspiracy (v. 12a), but should recognize Yahweh alone and absolutely as holy, and therefore fear him alone. In this case only v. 14a would involve a corruption or a later correction.[38]

---

33. A. H. Gunneweg, *Nehemia. KAT* XIX/2 (1987), 81.
34. See *BHS;* W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* XII (1968), 80; also *HAL,* III, 1153.
35. Wildberger, *BK* X/1², 337.
36. *BHS; HAL,* III, 1153; cf. Wildberger, 334-35.
37. See, respectively, *BHS;* Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12,* 357-58. For a different interpretation see B. Duhm, *Jesaja. HKAT* III/1 (⁵1968), 83-84; cf. *BHK.*
38. See also → קדשׁ *qdš* II.5.

Driver proposes a different theory.[39] Taking the LXX as his point of departure,[40] he assumes the meaning "difficulty" for *qešer* in v. 12a. He also believes that v. 13a originally contained a hiphil of the verb, with the meaning "find difficult." Finally, he finds a hiphil participle in v. 14a, with the meaning "cause of difficulty." There is no need, however, to postulate such a special meaning of the word group in this single OT passage.

III. Sirach. The rendering of the word group in Sirach is a matter of debate. Smend postulates the special meaning "transgress(ion)" for all occurrences in the book, but general usage elsewhere casts doubt on this approach.[41] We must distinguish a variety of meanings. If the LXX rendering is not totally inaccurate, the basic meaning "bind" may be assumed in 7:8 and 13:12. The idea behind 7:8 may be that a sinner who commits a sin a second time binds it on like a piece of jewelry, thus taking full possession of it (cf. Dt. 6:8; Prov. 3:3[42]); in this case *ḥṭ'* would be the object of the two preceding verbs.[43] In 13:12 *qāšar qešer* would be translated "put on fetters," as a metaphor for oppression, appropriate to the cruelty mentioned in v. 12a (cf. *qešer* in CD 13:10[44]); most interpreters, however, assume the meaning "conspire."[45] In 11:31, however, it is preferable to translate *qešer* as "conspiracy," an accurate characterization of the perfidious danger posed by a slanderer (v. 31a, *mḥmdyk* understood as denoting a group of persons). In 41:18 a clear interpretation is precluded by the simple fact that *qešer* appears only in the Masada ms.; ms. B reads *šeqer.*

Conrad

---

39. Pp. 82-84.
40. See I.2 above.
41. R. Smend, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach* (Berlin, 1906), *in loc.*
42. See II.1 above.
43. For other proposed interpretations see *HAL,* III, 1154.
44. See II.1 above.
45. G. Sauer, *Jesus Sirach. JSHRZ* III/5 (1981), 538.

קֶשֶׁת *qešeṯ;* קַשָּׁת *qaššāṯ*

I. Etymology. II. Ancient Near East. III. OT Usage: 1. Occurrences; 2. Constructions; 3. Hunting; 4. War; 5. Rainbow; 6. Figurative Use. IV. LXX. V. Dead Sea Scrolls.

---

qešet. W. F. Albright and G. E. Mendenhall, "The Creation of the Composite Bow in Canaanite Mythology," *JNES* 1 (1942) 227-29; H. Balfour, "On the Structure and Affinities of the Compos-

I. Etymology. In the OT Heb. *qešeṯ* means "bow" — either concretely as an instrument for hunting or war (or a rainbow) or figuratively as a symbol of power, sovereignty, war, etc.[1] It is a primary noun, well attested in the other Semitic languages: Akk. *qaštu(m)*,[2] Eblaite *qà-šù*,[3] Ugar. *qšt*,[4] Pun. *qšt*,[5] Old Aram. *qšt(')*,[6] Jewish Aram. *qšt(')*,[7] Sam. *qāšṯ*,[8] Palm. *qašt/qašṭ'*,[9] Mand. *qašta*,[10] Syr. *qeštā'*,[11] Arab. *qaus*,[12] and Eth. *qast*.[13]

---

ite Bow," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute* 19 (1890) 220-50; W. B. Barrick, "Elisha and the Magic Bow," *VT* 35 (1985) 354-63; U. Bechmann, "Bogen," *NBL*, 316-17; H. Bonnet, *Die Waffen der Völker des alten Orients* (Gütersloh, 1926); R. Borger, "Hiob XXXIX 23 nach dem Qumran-Targum," *VT* 27 (1977) 102-5; *idem*, "Die Waffenträger des Königs Darius," *VT* 22 (1972) 385-98; B. Couroyer, "L'arc d'airain," *RB* 72 (1965) 508-14; *idem*, "Corne et arc," *RB* 73 (1966) 510-21; *idem*, "*NḤT*: 'encorder un arc'?" *RB* 88 (1981) 13-18; W. Decker, "Bogen," *LexÄg*, I, 842-44; *idem*, *Die physische Leistung Pharaos* (Cologne, 1971); *idem* and J. Klauck, "Königliche Bogenschiessleistungen in der 18. ägyptischen Dynastie," *Kölner Beiträge zur Sportwissenschaft* 3 (1974) 23-55; L. Dürr, "Zum altorientalischen Gedankenkreis 'Der König als Meisterschütze im Bogenschiessen von der Gottheit unterrichtet' (Ps 18, 35; 144, 1)," *OLZ* 34 (1931) 697-98; W. Gross, "Bundeszeichen und Bundesschluss in der Priesterschrift," *TTZ* 87 (1978) 98-115; D. R. Hillers, "The Bow of Aqhat," *Orient and Occident. FS C. H. Gordon. AOAT* 22 (1973), 71-80; B. Hrouda, *Die Kulturgeschichte des assyrischen Flachbildes. Saarbrücker Beiträge zur Altertumskunde* 2 (Bonn, 1965); S. Iwry, "New Evidence for Belomancy in Ancient Palestine and Phoenicia," *JAOS* 81 (1961) 27-34; O. Keel, "Der Bogen als Herrschaftssymbol," *ZDPV* 93 (1977) 141-77; *idem*, *The Symbolism of the Biblical World* (Eng. trans. New York, 1978); *idem*, *Wirkmächtige Siegeszeichen im AT. OBO* 5 (1974); M. Korfmann, *Schleuder und Bogen in Südwestasien bis zum Beginn der Stadtstaaten* (Bonn, 1972); W. McLeod, *Composite Bows from the Tomb of Tut'ankhamūn. Tut'ankhamūn's Tomb Series* 3 (Oxford, 1970); A. Pavlica, "Der Regenbogen als Zeichen des Bundes," *BZ* 13 (1915) 289-91; G. Rausing, *The Bow. Acta Archaeologica Lundensia* 6 (Bonn, 1967); U. Rüterswörden, "Der Bogen in Genesis 9," *UF* 20 (1989) 247-63; E. Salonen, *Die Waffen der alten Mesopotamier. StOr* 33 (1965), esp. 39-45; J. M. Sasson, *The Military Establishments at Mari. StPohl* 3 (1969); T. Säve-Söderbergh, "Bogenvölker." *LexÄg*, I, 844-45; H. Schäfer, "König Amenophis II als Meisterschütze," *OLZ* 34 (1931) 89-96; *idem*, "Weiteres zum Bogenschiessen im alten Ägypten," *OLZ* 34 (1931) 89-96; Y. Sukenik, "The Composite Bow of the Canaanite Goddess Anath," *BASOR* 107 (1947) 11-15; E. Uphill, "The Nine Bows," *JEOL* 19 (1965/66) 393-420; H. Weippert, "Bogen," *BRL*², 49-50; Y. Yadin, *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands* (2 vols.; Eng. trans. New York, 1963); *idem*, "The Earliest Representation of a Siege Scene and a 'Scythian Bow' from Mari," *IEJ* 22 (1972) 89-94; E. Zenger, *Gottes Bogen in den Wolken. SBS* 112 (²1987).

1. *BLe*, §61g.
2. *AHw*, II, 906-7; *CAD*, Q, 147-56; Salonen, 39-42.
3. G. Pettinato, *Old Canaanite Texts of the Third Millennium* (Malibu, 1979), 12.
4. *UT*, no. 2287; *WUS*, no. 2466; cf. M. Dahood, *RSP*, I, 258, 332-34; idem, *RSP*, II, 29.
5. A. Berthier and R. Charlier, *Le sanctuaire punique d'El-Hofra à Constantine* (Paris, 1952-55), 82; Tomback, 295.
6. S. Segert, *Altaramäische Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1975), 550.
7. Jastrow, 1433.
8. *LOT*, II, 583.
9. Tomback, 295.
10. *MdD*, 404.
11. *LexSyr*, 703.
12. Lane, I/7, 2574-75.
13. *LexLingAeth*, 433-34.

Biblical Heb. *qešeṯ* survives in the Dead Sea Scrolls as well as in Rabbinic Hebrew.[14] The only derivative in Biblical Hebrew is the noun *qaššāṯ*, "quiver," a hapax legomenon in Gen. 21:20,[15] well attested in Post-Biblical Hebrew as the term for the zodiacal sign Saggitarius;[16] cf. the Aramaic loanword *qōšeṭ*, "bowshot" (Ps. 60:6 [Eng. 4]), also a hapax legomenon.[17]

II. Ancient Near East. In all probability the earliest civilizations of the ancient Near East knew only the simple wooden bow consisting of a flexible stave of wood, occasionally reinforced with twisted sinew or cord, with its ends held together by a bowstring. Greater range was achieved by the recurved bow, with its bowstring closer to the grip; it is documented for the Middle Bronze IIA period in an Egyptian tomb painting.[18] In Mesopotamia an improved bow was developed, the so-called composite bow, consisting of several wooden laminae bound or glued together. This type of bow was introduced into Palestine during the Late Bronze Age[19] and into Egypt during the New Kingdom. Although the composite bow was actually made of wood, its back could be covered with dense sinew and its interior curves reinforced with horn.[20] The greatest elasticity, however, was offered by the recurved composite bow, a combination attested at Mari as early as the Early Bronze Age.[21]

Although the OT speaks of a bow of bronze (*qešeṯ-nᵉḥûšâ*, 2 S. 22:35 par. Ps. 18:35[34]; Job 20:24), there is no archeological evidence for such bows apart from two found at Susa, clearly to be understood as votive offerings. Like the well-known horn bow from Egypt, such copper bows are not nearly elastic enough to function effectively as a bow for hunting or war.[22]

With these exceptions, only wooden bows have been found in the ancient Near East, and these only in Egypt, where the climate is favorable for preserving wood. In Palestine, by contrast, there is only indirect evidence like the flint arrowheads from Neolithic Jericho[23] and later arrowheads of iron and bronze.

The bowstring (*yeṯer* II, Ps. 11:2; Job 30:11;[24] *mêṯār*, Ps. 21:13[12]) could be made of animal sinew or cords of twisted hemp or linen.[25] To preserve its tension, the bow was not bent until just before use.[26] The bow might be bent by hand (*hirkîḇ yāḏ ʿal-haqqešeṯ*, 2 K. 13:16) or by pressing a foot against the curve of the bow (*dārak qešeṯ*,

14. See, respectively, V below; Jastrow, 1433.
15. *HAL*, III, 1156.
16. Jastrow, 1433.
17. Wagner, 273; *KBL*, III, 1056.
18. *AOB*, no. 51; *ANEP*, no. 3.
19. G. Loud, *Megiddo: Seasons of 1935-39*, II (Chicago, 1948), pl. 152, no. 154.
20. Albright and Mendenhall; Sukenik; Weippert, 50.
21. Yadin, "Earliest Representation."
22. B. Grdseloff, *ZÄS* 74 (1938) 52-55, 136-39.
23. Weippert, 50.
24. *AuS*, VI, 330-31.
25. *AOB*, no. 252.
26. *TGI*², 5.

Ps. 11:2, etc.).[27] The more general term is *māšak baqqešeṯ,* "draw the bow" (1 K. 22:34; 2 Ch. 18:33).[28]

When shooting, the archer (*rōmēh qešeṯ,* Jer. 4:29; Ps. 78:9; *tōp̄ēś haqqešeṯ,* Am. 2:15) holds the bow in his left hand and draws the bowstring with his right, while nocking the arrow (*ḥēṣ,* with *qešeṯ,* 2 K. 13:15 [twice]; Isa. 5:28; 7:24; Jer. 50:14; Ezk. 39:3,9; Ps. 11:2; Lam. 3:12; 1 Ch. 12:2; also *ben 'ašpâ,* Lam. 3:13; *ben-qešeṯ,* Job 41:20[28]; cf. *kônēn qešeṯ,* "lay an arrow firmly on the bow, ready the bow to shoot," Ps. 7:13[12]; hiphil, 2 Ch. 26:14).[29] On his left arm the archer wears a leather arm-and-finger guard for protection against the bowstring as it flies back.[30]

Arrows were carried in a quiver (*'ašpâ* [Akk. *išpatu*])[31] on the archer's back (Isa. 22:6; 49:2; Jer. 5:16 [text?]; Ps. 127:5; Job 39:23). Another word for "quiver" is **tᵉlî* (Gen. 27:3). The bow, too, could be kept in a leather case (**ṣeleṭ;* Akk. *šalṭu*);[32] this could be part of the equipment of a foot soldier, but it could also be fastened to a chariot.[33]

The range of a composite bow could exceed a hundred yards.[34] Archery demanded skill; it was practiced in various ways, including shooting at a target (1 S. 20:20).[35]

III. OT Usage.

1. *Occurrences.* The primary noun *qešeṯ* appears 76 times in OT Hebrew. Its occurrences are distributed as follows: 10 each in Jeremiah and Psalms; 7 in Genesis; 6 in Proto-Isaiah; 5 each in 1 Kings and 1 Chronicles; 4 each in 2 Kings, Hosea, and 2 Chronicles; 3 each in 1 Samuel, 2 Samuel, Zechariah, and Job; 2 each in Lamentations and Nehemiah; and 1 each in Joshua, Deutero-Isaiah, Trito-Isaiah, Amos, and Habakkuk.[36]

2. *Constructions.* The noun *qešeṯ* is used in a variety of constructions. Among these are: *dārak qešeṯ,* "bend the bow [by pressing a foot against its curve]" (Isa. 5:28; 21:15; Jer. 46:9; 50:14,29; 51:3; Jer. 46:9; 50:14,29; 51:3; Zec. 9:13; Ps. 7:13[12]; 11:2; 37:14; Lam. 2:4; 3:12; 1 Ch. 5:18; 2 Ch. 14:7[8]);[37] *hôrâ baqqešeṯ,* "shoot with the

27. Bonnet, 133-34; R. Ghirschman, *Syr* 35 (1958) 61-72; Yadin, *Art of Warfare,* 2:453; *HAL,* I, 231; Rüterswörden, 257-58.

28. Rüterswörden: "bend the bow." See III.2 below.

29. See also → חץ *ḥēṣ.* See also for Egypt: *AOB,* nos. 53, 105, 112; *ANEP,* nos. 333, 341; for Assyria: *AOB,* nos. 119, 130, 132; *ANEP,* no. 368.

30. Egypt: H. S. K. Bakry, *OrAnt* 6 (1967) 227-28, 240; Assyria: Hrouda, pl. 21.10-14; for ills. see Weippert, 49.

31. *HAL,* I, 96.

32. Borger, "Waffenträger."

33. For the former, in Egypt, see Yadin, *Art of Warfare,* 1:185, 199; in Assyria, see *AOB,* no. 138; *ANEP,* no. 371. For the latter see *AOB,* nos. 72, 78, 119; *ANEP,* nos. 314-16, 333; Weippert, 50.

34. Korfmann, 17-20; but cf. Rüterswörden, 253-54.

35. *AOB,* no. 53; *ANEP,* no. 390; Schäfer; Dürr; Decker, *Physische Leistung,* 80-122; Decker and Klauck; Keel, "Bogen," 169.

36. On conjectural emendations see *HAL,* III, 1156.

37. → דרך *derek;* Bonnet, 133-34.

bow" (1 S. 31:3; 1 Ch. 10:3; *yrh* I hiphil ptcp., "archer," 1 S. 31:3; 2 S. 11:24 *Q;* qal ptcp. 1 Ch. 10:3); *kônēn qešeṯ,* "lay an arrow firmly on the bow" = "ready the bow to shoot" (Ps. 7:13[12]; cf. the hiphil in 2 Ch. 26:14); *māšaḵ baqqešeṯ,* "draw the bow" (1 K. 22:34; 2 Ch. 18:33); *niḥaṯ* (piel) *qešeṯ,* "press the bow [to bend it]" (2 S. 22:35 par. Ps. 18:35[34]; cf. the niphal, "penetrate" [of arrows] in Ps. 38:3[2]); *nāšaq* II *qešeṯ,* "arm oneself with a bow" (1 Ch. 12:2; 2 Ch. 17:17; Ps. 78:9 with *rāmâ qešeṯ* [gloss?]); *'ērâ qešeṯ,* "bare one's bow" (Hab. 3:9 cj.); *hirkîḇ yāḏ 'al qešeṯ,* "bend one's bow by hand" (2 K. 13:16); *rāmâ qešeṯ,* "shoot with the bow" (Jer. 4:29; Ps. 78:9; cf. *qešeṯ rᵉmîyâ,* "treacherous bow," Hos. 7:16; Ps. 78:57); and *tāpaś haqqešeṯ,* "shoot with the bow" (Am. 2:15).

3. *Hunting.* The commonest form of hunting in the ancient Near East was with bow *(qešeṯ)* and arrow *(ḥēṣ).* People hunted both in pursuit of food and to prevent attack by danger beasts of prey — in Syria and Palestine primarily the lion *('aryēh),* the bear *(dōḇ,* 2 K. 2:24; Am. 5:19), and the wild ox *(rᵉ'ēm/rêm,* Job 39:9). Among the animals hunted for food, Dt. 14 mentions the fallow deer *('ayyāl,* fem. *'ayyeleṯ/'ayyālâ),* the gazelle *(ṣᵉḇî),* and the roebuck *(yaḥmûr),* all of which were brought to Solomon's table (1 K. 5:3[4:23]), as well as the wild goat *('aqqô),* the bison(?) (*dišôn* I), and a species of gazelle (**zemer*). The ibex (or mountain goat?) *(yā'ēl)* and the wild ass *('ārôḏ, 'ayir)* should probably also be included. The OT does not provide many details for the use of bow and arrow in hunting (*ṣayiḏ* I, Gen. 10:9; 25:27; cf. **ṣayyāḏ,* "hunter": Jer. 16:16; and the verb → צוד *ṣwd,* Gen. 27:3; Lam. 3:52; etc.). Maag is probably correct in his theory that the conflict between Esau and Jacob contains echoes of a myth in which Isaac's words represent Esau as an early stage of civilization that was later superseded: "Now then, take your weapons, your quiver and your bow *(kēlêḵā telyᵉḵā wᵉqašteḵā),* and go out to the field, and hunt game [*Q: ṣayiḏ; K: ṣydh*] for me" (Gen. 27:3).[38]

Hunting also lies behind the description of the devastation of the land of Judah in Isaiah's aide-mémoire to Ahaz during the Syro-Ephraimite War: the land will be transformed into a wilderness into which people will go only "with bow and arrow" (Isa. 7:24).[39]

4. *War.* In the early period the weapons used by the Israelite militia were naturally primitive. The OT accounts mention the following: sling (*qela'* I), a "strap with a wide lappet in the middle to hold a stone";[40] battle-ax *(mappēṣ;* also *paṭṭîš);* club *(tôṯāḥ);* spear *(hᵃnîṯ);* scimitar *(kîḏôn);* lance *(rōmaḥ);* dagger or short sword *(ḥereḇ);*[41] and bow and arrow.

Obviously the military bow was relatively rare in Syria and Palestine in the pre-Assyrian period, being used only by members of the upper class: the king (2 K. 13:15; Ps. 18:35[34]; 45:6[5]), the crown prince (1 S. 20:20; 2 S. 1:22), and military command-

38. V. Maag, *TZ* 13 (1957) 418-29.
39. On the figurative usage of the hunting bow see III.6 below.
40. H. J. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis. KAT* VIII/1 (1973), 332.
41. → חֶרֶב *ḥereḇ.*

ers (2 K. 9:24). To all appearances, it was not until the Assyrian period that archers became an established element of military forces, e.g., those of the Arameans (1 K. 22:34) the enemy from the north (Jer. 4:29; 6:23), as well as in Judah under King Uzziah (787-746; 2 Ch. 26:14). It is noteworthy that the tradition in 1 Ch. 12:1-7 includes among David's warriors archers *(nōšᵉqê qešeṯ),* "who could shoot arrows and sling stones with either hand" (v. 2), whereas the earlier tradition in 2 S. 23:8ff. makes no mention of them (possibly because the text of 2 S. 23:8-39 is very poorly preserved).[42]

5. *Rainbow.* The rainbow (*qešeṯ,* always with *be'ānān,* "in the clouds," Gen. 9:13,14,16; Ezk. 1:28) plays a theologically significant role in the OT, clearly distinct from the figurative usage of the hunting bow or the military bow.[43] Since Wellhausen, however, almost all exegetes have claimed that the flood narrative of P refers to a military bow laid down or hung up in the sky by the warrior Yahweh.[44] Although the notion of divine archers is well known in Israel and its ancient Near Eastern neighbors, the rainbow in the flood narrative has nothing to do with this tradition. The rainbow, which probably stood at the end of a flood narrative in the precursor of P, signifies nothing more than "a natural phenomenon after rain or a thunderstorm."[45] This enabled P to use the natural rainbow as a "sign of the covenant" (*'ôṯ bᵉrîṯ,* Gen. 9:13). According to P, the sign associated with the covenant serves as a pledge of God's commitment to humanity.[46]

Kronholm

Rüterswörden has stressed once more a connection between the hunting bow and the bow in the clouds. First, the OT is familiar with the conception of Yahweh's bow (Hab. 3:9; Lam. 2:4; 3:12); second, there is no need to view Yahweh's bow in Gen. 9 as being bent and ready for battle. The sight of this bow laid aside and relaxed, without its bowstring,[47] provides a new perspective; for now this bow is "a sign recalling Yahweh's pledge never again to inflict destruction on the earth and its inhabitants . . . , symbolizing the end of the deadly conflict between Yahweh and the world he created." The relaxed bow signalizes "the relaxation of tensions, the detente, between Yahweh and creation by reversal of a motif that had heralded the exile [as in Jer. 4:29; 6:23], the reversal of an image representing Yahweh's enmity."[48]

Fabry

The bow in the clouds thenceforth bears witness to God's yes to the created world and life within it: God alone guarantees that humankind will never be extinguished —

---

42. J. H. Grønbæk, *Die Geschichte vom Aufstieg Davids* (Copenhagen, 1971), 95-96 n. 66.
43. See III.6 below.
44. See esp. H. Gunkel, *Genesis. HKAT* I (^{9}1977), 150-51; for an exhaustive bibliog. see Rüterswörden.
45. C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1984), 473, with bibliog.
46. → אות *'ôṯ;* cf. Gen. 21:30; 38:17. → ברית *bᵉrîṯ.*
47. Rüterswörden, 247-48 nn. 2-3.
48. *Ibid.,* 259.

neither by natural catastrophes nor by wickedness and sin. "It reminds the Creator that, in assuming dominion over the 'house of life' of creation, in the conflict between justice and compassion, wrath and mercy, God's choice has always favored the fundamental value 'life.'"[49]

In the account of Ezekiel's call (Ezk. 1:1–3:15), the rainbow represents the splendor and appearance of God's glory (1:28; cf. Sir. 43:11; 50:7).[50]

6. *Figurative Use.* Figurative use of the noun *qešet* in the OT is common and varied. Often the bow serves as a general symbol for a long-distance weapon, in parallel with the short sword *(ḥereḇ),* which represents weapons used in close combat. The expression "bow and (short) sword" *(qešeṯ wᵉḥereḇ,* Hos. 2:20[18]) thus denotes weapons collectively (Gen. 48:22; Josh. 24:12; 1 S. 18:4; 2 S. 1:22; 2 K. 6:22; Isa. 21:15; Ps. 44:7[6]; see also Ps. 7:13[12]; 37:14; 76:4[3]; 1 Ch. 5:18).[51] This usage shows that a formula like "take with one's sword and bow" (Gen. 48:22; cf. 2 K. 6:22) is tantamount to "take by one's own efforts." In a hymnic prayer, conversely, the people of God affirm: "Not in my bow do I trust, nor can my sword save me" (Ps. 44:7[6]). They trust only in Yahweh (the warrior), not in their own strength (cf. Josh. 24:12; Hos. 1:7). The bow can also function as a metaphor for "war" (e.g., *qešeṯ milḥāmâ,* Zec. 9:10).

In Zec. 10:4, finally, the military bow stands for something quite different: along with "cornerstone" or "pinnacle" *(pinnâ;* cf. Jgs. 20:2; 1 S. 14:38; Isa. 19:13; Zeph. 3:6), "tent peg" *(yāṯēḏ;* cf. Gk. *stýloi* [Gal. 2:9]),[52] and "commander" *(nōgēś;* cf. Isa. 14:2,4), the "bow" is a metaphor for the charismatic leader of the eschaton. As we see in Isa. 21:16-17 and Job 29:20, the "bow" can also parallel "glory" *(kāḇôḏ).*

The bow can thus express the power and military might of a nation. Most of the OT passages using it in this sense, however, speak of the breaking of this bow. The earliest text is Hosea's threat pronounced in the name of Yahweh: "On that day I will break the bow of Israel [*qešeṯ yiśrā'ēl,* which could also mean 'the bow Israel'; cf. Am. 5:2[53]] in the valley of Jezreel" (Hos. 1:5). Similar words appear in an oracle of Yahweh against Elam, dating from 597 B.C.E.: "I am going to break the bow of Elam, the mainstay of their might *(rē'šîṯ gᵉḇûrṯām)*" (Jer. 49:35; cf. also *šbr* qal in Hos. 2:20[18]; piel in Ps. 46:10[9]; 76:4[3]). But this oracle continues with a prophecy that Yahweh will set up his throne in Elam, a notion resembling the Egyptian notion of the pharaoh, who "with bent bow reigns enthroned over beasts or humans or both."[54] But the OT is clearly unfamiliar with the conception of the peoples of the earth as nine bows under the feet of Pharaoh,[55] although Ps. 83:7-9(6-8) names nine enemy peoples; see also the comms. on Ps. 110.

---

49. Zenger, 181.
50. → נגה *nōgah;* → כבוד *kāḇôḏ.*
51. See also Keel, *Siegeszeichen,* 26.
52. R. Mach, *Der Zaddik in Talmud und Midrasch* (Leiden, 1957), 142.
53. Keel, "Bogen," 172 n. 136.
54. *Ibid.,* 153.
55. Uphill; Säve-Söderbergh.

IV. LXX. The LXX normally uses *tóxon* to translate *qešeṯ;* on occasion this same word can also represent *'ašpâ,* "quiver" (Job 39:23), or *ḥēṣ,* "arrow" (Ps. 64:4[3]; cf. also 1 Ch. 12:2). In a few cases we find *tóxeuma* (Isa. 7:24; 13:18; 21:15,16). In the LXX *toxótēs,* "archer," translates such phrases as *rōḇeh qaššāṯ* (Gen. 21:20), *dōrēḵ qešeṯ* (2 Ch. 14:7), *nōšeq qešeṯ* (2 Ch. 17:17), and *tōp̄ēś haqqešeṯ* (Am. 2:15).

V. Dead Sea Scrolls. The noun *qešeṯ* occurs twice in the War Scroll from Qumran. The description of the equipment of the seven cavalry divisions mentions bows *(qšt)* along with circular shields *(mgny 'glh),* lances *(rmḥ),* arrows *(ḥṣym),* and war javelins *(zrqwt mlḥmh)* (1QM 6:15-16). The meaning of the word *qšt* in 1QM 9:10-11 is uncertain; it appears that the expressions "circle of hands and towers" *(glyl kpym wmgdlwt)* and "bows and towers" *(qšt wmgdlwt)* designate different battle formations.

In 1QH 6:30 the subject is the divine hero *(gbwr):* the oppressed righteous hymnodist hopes devoutly that this hero "will bend his bow and break open the fortress" *(wydrwk gbwr qštw wypth mṣwr).*

Kronholm

רָאָה *rā'â;* רֹאֶה *rō'eh* I and II; רְאִי *rᵉ'î;* רְאוּת *rᵉ'ûṯ;* מַרְאֶה *mar'eh;* מַרְאָה *mar'â*

I. Etymology. II. Ancient Near East: 1. Canaanite; 2. Egyptian; 3. Akkadian. III. OT: 1. Occurrences; 2. Lexical Field, Idioms; 3. Everyday Usage; 4. Specialized Usage; 5. Theological Usage; 6. Nouns. IV. 1. Dead Sea Scrolls; 2. LXX.

---

rā'â. R. Albertz, "Jer 1–6 und die Frühverkündigung Jeremias," *ZAW* 94 (1982) 20-47; S. Amsler, "La parole visionaire des prophètes," *VT* 31 (1981) 359-63; C. Barth, "Theophanie, Bundesschliessung und neuer Anfang am dritten Tag," *EvT* 28 (1968) 521-33; W. Graf von Baudissin, "'Gott schauen' in der alttestamentlichen Religion," *ARW* 18 (1915) 173-239; repr. as an appendix in Nötscher, below); C. T. Begg, "2 Kings 20:12-19 as an Element of Deuteronomistic History," *CBQ* 48 (1986) 27-38; A. Berner, "Esther and the Land of *mar'āh,*" *BethM* 26 (1980/81) 267-78; *idem,* "*Mar'â* and *mar'ēh,*" *BethM* 25 (1979/80) 132-49, 373-74; H. Becker, *Redeformen des Rechtslebens im AT. WMANT* 14 ([3]1970); T. Booij, "Hagar's Words in Gen XVI 13B," *VT* 30 (1980) 1-7; *idem,* "The Hebrew Text of Psalm XCII 11," *VT* 38 (1988) 210-14; M. Buber, *Sehertum, Anfang und Ausgang* (Cologne, 1955); E. Burrow, *The Oracles of Balaam* (London, 1939); D. L. Christensen, "Two Stanzas of a Hymn in Deuteronomy 33," *Bibl* 64 (1984) 382-89; R. E. Clements, *Prophecy and Covenant. SBT* 1/43 (1965); F. Crüsemann, "Zwei alttestamentliche Witze," *ZAW* 92 (1980) 215-27; J. H. Eaton, "Some Misunderstood Words for God's Self-Revelation," *BT* 25 (1974) 331-38; J. A. Emerton, "Notes on the Text and Translation of Isaiah XXII 8-11 and LXV 5," *VT* 30 (1980) 437-51; G. Fohrer, "Offenbarung und AT," *Grundlagen des Glaubens* (1970), 31-51; C. T. Fritsch, "A Study of the Greek Translation of the Hebrew Verbs 'to see' with Deity as Subject or Object," *FS H. M. Orlinsky* = *ErIsr* 16 (1982) 51*-57*; H. F. Fuhs, *Sehen und Schauen. FzB* 32 (1978); *idem,* "*ḥzh* — Zu einem angeblichen Aramaismus im Hebräischen," *BN* 2 (1977) 7-12; S. D. Glison, "Exodus 6:3 in Pentateuchal Criticism," *Restoration Quarterly* 28 (1985/86) 135-45; H. Haag, "Offenbaren in der hebräischen Bibel," *TZ* 16 (1960) 251-58; R. N. Haber, ed., *Vision* (Washington, 1968); J. Hänel, *Das Erkennen Gottes bei den S*

chriftpropheten. BWANT 4 (1923); H. Haran, "The Divine Presence in the Israelite Cult and the Cultic Institutions," *Bibl* 50 (1969) 251-67; S. L. Harris, "Wisdom or Creation?" *VT* 33 (1983) 419-27; F. Häusermann, *Symbol und Wortempfang in der alttestamentlichen Prophetie. BZAW* 58 (1932); R. Hentschke, *Die Stellung der vorexilischen Schriftpropheten zum Kultus. BZAW* 75 (1957), esp. 148-74; S. Herrmann, *Die prophetischen Heilserwartungen im AT. BWANT* 85 (1965); V. Hirth, *Boten Gottes im AT. ThArb* 32 (1975); M. Jastrow, "*Rô'ēh* and *Ḥôzē* in the OT," *JBL* 28 (1909) 42-56; A. Jepsen, *Nabi* (Munich, 1934); J. Jeremias, *Theophanie. WMANT* 10 ([2]1977); A. R. Johnson, *The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel* (Cardiff, [2]1962); H. Junker, *Prophet und Seher in Israel* (Bonn, 1927); E. C. Kingsbury, "The Theophanic *Topos* and the Mountain of God," *JBL* 86 (1967) 205-10; R. Knierim, "Offenbarung im AT," *FS G. von Rad* (Munich, 1971), 206-35; K. Koch, "P — Kein Redaktor!" *VT* 37 (1987) 446-67, esp. 462-65; K. Koenen, "Wer sieht wen?" *VT* 38 (1988) 468-74; E. König, *Der Offenbarungsbegriff im AT,* 2 (Leipzig, 1882); H.-J. Kraus, "Hören und Sehen in der althebräischen Tradition," *Biblisch-theologische Aufsätze* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1972), 84-101; J. K. Kselmann, "A Note on *lr'wt* in Ps 40,13," *Bibl* 63 (1982) 552-54; W. E. Lemke, "The Near and Distant God," *JBL* 100 (1981) 541-55; C. Levin, Der Dekalog am Sinai," *VT* 35 (1985) 165-91; J. Lindblom, *Prophecy in Ancient Israel* (Eng. trans. Philadelphia, 1963); P. Maiberger, "Ein Konjekturvorschlag zu Ex 16,32," *ZAW* 95 (1983) 112-18; H. Middendorf, *Gott sieht* (1935); R. W. L. Moberly, "The Earliest Commentary on the Akedah," *VT* 38 (1988) 302-23, esp. 306-7; H. Mölle, *Das Erscheinen Gottes im Pentateuch. EHS* XXIII/18 (1973); H. P. Müller, "Theonome Skepsis und Lebensfreude," *BZ* 30 (1986) 1-19; R. E. Murphy, "Can 2:8-17 — A Unified Poem?" *FS M. Delcor. AOAT* 215 (1985), 305-10; K. Namiki, "Homer, Ugaritic Literature and the OT," *Christianity and Culture* 16 (1982) 47-102; H. Niehr, "Zur Intention von Jes 6,9-10," *BN* 21 (1983) 59-65; F. Nötscher, *"Das Angesicht Gottes schauen" nach biblischer und babylonischer Auffassung* (Darmstadt, 1925, repr. 1969); H. M. Orlinsky, "The Seer in Ancient Israel," *OrAnt* 4 (1965) 153-74; *idem,* "The Seer-Priest and the Prophet in Ancient Israel," *Essays in Biblical Culture and Bible Translation. FS H. M. Orlinsky* (New York, 1974), 39-65; D. L. Petersen, *The Roles of Israel's Prophets. JSOTSup* 17 (1981); O. Plöger, "Priester und Prophet," *ZAW* 63 (1951) 157-92; W. H. Propp, "The Skin of Moses' Face — Transfigured or Disfigured?" *CBQ* 49 (1987) 375-86; J. Reindl, *Das Angesicht Gottes im Sprachgebrauch des ATs. ETS* 25 (1970); R. Rendtorff, "The Concept of Revelation in Ancient Israel," in W. Pannenberg, ed., *Revelation as History* (Eng. trans. New York, 1968), 23-53; = *ThB* 57 (1975) 39-59; F. Rouillard, "Les sens de Job 33,21," *RB* 91 (1984) 30-50; E. Ruprecht, "Exodus 24,9-11 als Beispiel lebendiger Erzähltradition aus der Zeit des babylonischen Exils," *FS C. Westermann* (Göttingen, 1980), 138-73; A. Saviv, "God Sees," *BethM* 26 (1980/81) 279-81; H. Schmid, "Gottesbild, Gottesschau und Theophanie," *Jud* 23 (1967) 241-54; W. H. Schmidt, "Ausprägungen des Bilderverbots?" *FS G. Friedrich* (Stuttgart, 1973), 25-34; F. Schnutenhaus, "Das Kommen und Erscheinen Gottes im AT," *ZAW* 76 (1964) 1-22; E. Schütz, "Formgeschichte der vorklassischen Prophetie" (diss., Bonn, 1958); H. Seebass, "Zum Text von Gen XVI 13B," *VT* 21 (1971) 254-56; C. L. Seow, "A Textual Note on Lamentations 1:20," *CBQ* 47 (1985) 416-19; A. VanSeters, "Isaiah 40:1-11," *Int* 35 (1981) 401-4; M. S. Smith, "'Seeing God' in the Psalms," *CBQ* 50 (1988) 171-83; M. A. Vanden Oudenrijn, "De vocabulis quibusdam, termino נביא synonymis," *Bibl* 6 (1925) 294-311; A. S. van der Woude, "Der Engel des Bundes," *FS H. W. Wolff* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1981), 289-300; D. Vetter, "ראה *r'h* sehen," *THAT,* II, 692-701; *idem, Seherspruch und Segensschilderung. CThM* A/4 (1974); S. Wagner, "Offenbarungsphänomenologische Elemente in der Bileam-Geschichte von Numeri 22–24," *ThV* 5 (1975) 11-31; E. C. Webster, "A Rhetorical Study of Isaiah 66," *JSOT* 34 (1986) 93-108; C. Westermann, *Praise and Lament in the Psalms* (Eng. trans. Atlanta, 1981); G. E. Whitney, "Alternative Interpretations of *lō'* in Exodus 6:3 and Jeremiah 7:22," *Westminster Theological Journal* 48 (1986) 151-59; D. P. Wright, "Deuteronomy 21:1-9 as a Rite of Elimination," *CBQ* 49 (1987) 387-403; W. Zimmerli, "Die Bedeutung der grossen Schriftprophetie für das alttestamentliche Reden von Gott," *Studies in the Religion of Ancient Israel. SVT* 23 (1972), 48-64; *idem,* "'Offenbaren' im AT," *EvT* 22 (1962) 15-31.

I. Etymology. The root *r'(y)* is attested most widely in the South Semitic languages: OSA *r'y*[1]; Eth. *rĕ'ĕya,* "see," with the nominal derivatives *rĕ'ĕyat,* "view, vision"; *ra'āy,* "viewer, observer"; *'ar'ayā,* "image, form, example"; *nĕrĕāy,* "horizon";[2] Arab. *ra'ā,* "see," with the deverbal nouns *ra'y,* "view, opinion"; *ru'ya,* "seeing, viewing, inspection"; *ra'yā,* "vision, dream"; *mar'an,* "sight, vision, apparition"; *mir'āt,* "mirror, reflection"; *ri'ā'/riyā',* "eye service, hypocrisy"; *rā'in,* "viewer, observer."[3] Among the Canaanite languages, apart from Hebrew, *r'y* is found only in the closely related Moabite.[4] Ugar. *r'ydn* is uncertain.[5] Cassuto separates the text, reading *r'y dn,* which he translates as "great to look upon";[6] Caquot sees a reference to the god Ra'idān.[7] Aram. *rēw(ā),* "appearance," is probably a Canaanite loanword.[8]

In these languages *r'y* constitutes the semic basis for sensory perception: "see (with one's eyes)." From this basic meaning evolve all the other aspects of perception.

II. Ancient Near East.

1. *Canaanite.* Outside the Hebrew Bible, *rā'â* occurs three times in the Lachish Letters. In one text the qal means "keep watch [from a military observation post], observe carefully": ". . . for we can no longer see [the signals] from Azekah."[9] This fortified city is first mentioned in Josh. 10:10ff.; according to 2 Ch. 11:9, it was part of the ring of fortresses established by Rehoboam.[10] In contrast to the statement in Jer. 34:7, the letter indicates that Azekah had already fallen. The immediate context illustrates the perilous situation of Jerusalem: "May my lord know that we are waiting for the signals from Lachish."[11] The hiphil *rā'â* means "cause to see [good health]"; it occurs twice with Yahweh as subject in the complimentary formulas of an epistolary salutation[12] and conclusion.[13]

Moabite, a closely related language, uses the qal and hiphil of *rā'â* in the sense of "(cause to) see [with satisfaction]."[14] In the same inscription[15] derivation of the word *ryt* from *r'h* is disputed.[16]

---

1. ContiRossini, 235; Biella, 473-74; Beeston, 112-13.
2. *LexLingAeth,* 296-300.
3. Wehr, 319-20.
4. *DISO,* 268-69; *KAI,* 181.4,7.
5. *KTU,* 1.3, I, 12-13.
6. U. Cassuto, *Bulletin of the Jewish Palestine Exploration Society* 10 (1942/43) 50; *idem, The Goddess Anath* (Eng. trans. Jerusalem, 1971), 85, 110; cf. J. Aistleitner, *ZAW* 57 (1939) 210; *WUS* no. 2469; *ANET*^{3}, 136; E. Ullendorff, *JSS* 7 (1962) 346; J. C. de Moor, *Seasonal Patterns in the Ugaritic Myth of Ba'lu. AOAT* 16 (1971), 67.
7. A. Caquot and M. Sznycer, *Les religions du Proche-Orient asiatique* (Paris, 1970), 391.
8. *BLA,* §51k'; *KBL*^{2}, 1123; Beyer, 692; but cf. de Moor, *Seasonal Patterns,* 16, 74.
9. *KAI,* 194.12.
10. G. Beyer, *ZDPV* 54 (1931) 113-14.
11. *KAI,* 194.10-11.
12. *KAI,* 196.1-2.
13. *KAI,* 195.7-8.
14. *KAI,* 181.4: "grant victory"; 181.7: "triumph over."
15. *KAI,* 181.12.
16. See the discussion in *KAI,* II, 175.

2. *Egyptian.* Egyptian does not possess a semic base comparable to South Sem./ Heb./Moab. *r'(y)* in generating an extensive and highly differentiated semantic field. It uses instead a variety of expressions for sensory perception. The most important are *dgy,*[17] *ptr/pty,*[18] and *ḫ'y* (noun: *ḫ'w*),[19] all three of which are found as early as the Pyramid Texts.

The verb *dgy* denotes purely sensory apperception: "see [with one's eyes]," e.g., someone's face or person, as well as enhanced forms of vision, "view, observe, notice," e.g., the sun, the stars; recognize beauty, truth, goodness, but also "look beautifully or radiantly," see into the future; as a royal title: "who may look upon everything that is holy," or as a title of the sun, "which gives the power to see [= knowledge] to those who look upon it"; and finally "to see [= seek out, visit] someone": the king (for an audience), a god, the temple.

The verb *ptr/pty* likewise denotes sensory perception, "see [with one's eyes]," but is usually used figuratively: to experience or find victory, benefits, hidden secrets; come to know someone or something. The term *ptr* is often used as an interjection to call attention at the beginning of a discourse and to lend solemnity to a treaty; the phrase *ḥh ptr* expresses a benediction.

The semantic domain of *rā'â* niphal is covered by Egyp. *ḫ'y,* which refers in the first instance to the rising of the sun and figuratively to its beautiful (= salvific) rising. From the sun, *ḫy* is transferred to gods and the pharaoh, e.g., "appear as a great god" in a temple at a festival, appear before human beings at a festival. The pharaoh appears to the people similarly on his throne; he appears as promoter of justice, in a city, for battle, as victor.

The verb *gmḥ* is well attested from the Middle Kingdom onward. It refers to the visual faculty of the eyes in general; figuratively it means "observe, catch sight of," e.g., one's face in the water or in a mirror, the sun, enemies; "be farsighted = circumspect" in performing work; specialized sense: "see into the future or eternity"; also an exclamation in dirges. From the Eighteenth Dynasty on, *nw* serves as a general term for the visual faculty.

3. *Akkadian.* Akk. *amāru* is semantically equivalent to *rā'â,* which it resembles in range of meanings, nominal derivatives, and wide distribution of occurrences.[20] The entire semantic evolution of the verb is grounded in the visual faculty, in conjunction with *ina īnī,* "I saw it all with my own eyes."

Besides sensory perception, *amāru* denotes complex perceptual processes such as "discover, experience, receive"; "experience good fortune," "see hard times." In some texts *amāru* takes on the meaning "find, come upon, determine, discover." Used figuratively, *amāru* appears in various semantic constellations: "find [after a search], select"; in a specialized sense, "obtain" an astronomical or mathematical result; also "learn, ex-

17. *WbÄS,* V, 497-98.
18. *WbÄS,* I, 564.
19. *WbÄS,* III, 239-41.
20. For more details see *AHw,* I, 40-42; *CAD,* A/II, 5-27.

perience," "examine, observe carefully," "inspect"; also (in military contexts) "muster"; finally, "care for, attend to," particularly "seek out, visit."

Among many idiomatic expressions, we may single out *amāru pānū,* "behold someone's face," especially the king's. This expression derives from court ceremony; in the first instance it means "appear before the king" to demonstrate loyalty, then "be granted an audience," in the case of someone who does not "constantly behold the face of the king," i.e., someone not in the king's service — a token of special favor that means life and good fortune.

The idiom *amāru šamaš,* "behold the sun," means "live." The words "he will live long and behold the sun" refer to a full and happy life.

The verb *amāru* appears also in cultic language and the vocabulary of prayer. Religious texts employ it in its full semantic range. Omens such a birds, astronomical constellations, and blood are observed; demons appear; an individual receives a divine answer. Many texts say that the supplicant sees the favor of the deity. To "behold the face" of a particular god means concretely to come with prayer and sacrifice before the image or statue of that deity — exceptionally at a sacrificial site in a private house, as a rule in the temple — to receive favor and aid. "To behold the face of a deity" is not, however, a technical cultic term for "visit the temple"; it always entails a quest for the gracious, living countenance of the deity, from which help and salvation radiate. Secondarily, "behold God" comes to mean the effort to obtain divine assistance, an effort that itself guarantees divine favor.

III. OT.

1. *Occurrences.* The verb *rā'â* occurs 1,303 times in the OT.[21] Of these occurrences, 1,129 are qal forms:[22] Genesis, 123; Exodus, 70; Leviticus, 37; Numbers, 39; Deuteronomy, 56; Joshua, 15; Judges, 34; 1 Samuel, 74; 2 Samuel, 43; 1 Kings, 25; 2 Kings, 55; Isaiah, 74; Jeremiah, 66; Ezekiel, 70; Hosea, 4; Joel, 1 (3:1[Eng. 2:28]); Amos, 5; Obadiah, 2 (12,13); Jonah, 2 (3:10; 4:5); Micah, 5; Nahum, 1 (3:7); Habakkuk, 6; Haggai, 2 (2:3 twice); Zechariah, 18; Malachi, 2 (1:5; 3:18); Psalms, 87; Job, 50; Proverbs, 12; Ruth, 2 (1:18; 2:18); Song of Songs, 7; Ecclesiastes, 46; Lamentations, 16; Esther, 12; Daniel, 18; Ezra, 2; Nehemiah, 6; 1 Chronicles, 19; 2 Chronicles, 24. Niphal forms occur 102 times: Genesis, 14; Exodus, 16; Leviticus, 10; Numbers, 5; Deuteronomy, 5; Judges, 6; 1 Samuel, 2 (1:22; 3:21); 2 Samuel, 3 (17:17; 22:11,16); 1 Kings, 11; 2 Kings, 1 (23:24); Isaiah, 4; Jeremiah, 2 (13:26; 31:3); Ezekiel, 4; Zechariah, 1 (9:14); Malachi, 1 (3:2); Psalms, 5; Proverbs, 1 (27:25); Song of Songs, 1 (2:12); Daniel, 4; 2 Chronicles, 6. The hiphil occurs 62 times: Genesis, 3 (12:1; 41:28; 48:11); Exodus, 4; Numbers, 3 (8:4; 13:26; 23:3); Deuteronomy, 6; Joshua, 1 (5:6); Judges, 4; 2 Samuel, 1 (15:25); 2 Kings, 7; Isaiah, 4; Jeremiah, 3 (11:18; 24:1; 38:21); Ezekiel, 3 (11:25; 40:4 [twice]); Amos, 4; Micah, 1 (7:15); Nahum, 1 (3:5); Habakkuk, 1 (1:3); Zechariah, 3 (1:9; 2:3[1:20]; 3:1); Psalms, 8; Song of Songs, 1 (2:14); Ecclesi-

---

21. Vetter, *THAT,* II, 692; and *KBL*², 861: 1300.
22. Vetter, *THAT,* II, 692; *HAL,* III, 1156; *KBL*², 862 (probably correctly): 1,140.

astes, 1 (2:24); Esther, 3 (1:4,11; 4:8). The hophal occurs 4 times (Ex. 25:40; 26:30; Lev. 13:49; Dt. 4:35) and the hithpael 5 (Gen. 42:1; 2 K. 14:8,11; 2 Ch. 25:17[*Q*],21). The pual occurs once (Job 33:21).

The verb appears in all the books of the OT except Zephaniah. There is a striking concentration of occurrences in Genesis (141, out of a total of 328 in the Pentateuch) and Psalms (100). Also noteworthy are the difference in usage between Ecclesiastes (47) and Proverbs (13) and the paucity of occurrences in the Chronicler's History (55) in comparison to the Dtr History (224).

Among the noun forms, we come first to the basic word *r^oʾî*, "seeing" (Gen. 16:13a,14; 1 S. 16:12; Job 33:21). Other nouns derived from the verb include: *mar'eh* (103 occurrences: Genesis, 11; Ex. 3:3; 24:17; Leviticus, 11; Num. 8:4; 9:15,16; 12:8; Dt. 28:34,67; Josh. 22:10; Jgs. 13:6 [twice]; 2 S. 11:2; 14:27; 23:21[*Q*]; Isa. 11:3; 52:14; 53:2; Ezekiel, 36; Joel 2:4 [twice]; Nah. 2:5[4]; Job 4:16; 41:1[9]; Cant. 2:14 [twice]; 5:15; Eccl. 6:9; 11:9; Esther, 4; Daniel, 12), *mar'â* (12 times: Gen. 46:2; Ex. 38:8; Nu. 12:6; 1 S. 3:15; Ezk. 1:1; 8:3; 40:2; 43:3; Dnl. 10:7[twice],8,16), *rō'eh* I (11 times: 1 S. 9:9[twice],11,18,19; Isa. 30:10; 1 Ch. 9:22; 26:28; 29:29; 2 Ch. 16:7,10), *rō'eh* II (Isa. 28:7),[23] *r^e'ûṯ* (Eccl. 5:10[*Q;* Eng. 11]), *r^eʾî* (Job 37:18). The derivation of → תאר *tō'ar* (15 times; used in parallel with *mar'eh* in Gen. 29:17; 39:6; Isa. 52:14; 53:2; Est. 2:7) from *r'h* is disputed. Lev. 11:14 indicates that in Dt. 14:13 *dā'â* should be read instead of *rā'â*.[24] Several personal names contain *r'h* as an element.[25]

2. *Lexical Field, Idioms.* A variety of verbs belonging to the lexical field "perceive, recognize," appear in the immediate and extended context of *rā'â*. These include *nbṭ* piel and hiphil (e.g., 2 K. 3:14; Hab. 1:5; Ps. 22:18[17]; 80:15[14]; 142:5[4]; Job 35:5; Lam. 1:12; 2:20; 1 Ch. 21:21), *bîn* (Isa. 6:9; 32:3,4; 44:18; Job 11:11), *śîm* (Isa. 41:20), *śāḵal* (Isa. 41:20; 44:18), *šûr* (e.g., Nu. 24:17), *qāšaḇ* (Isa. 32:3-4), → חזה *ḥāzâ* (e.g., Nu. 24:16), *pāqaḏ* (1 S. 14:17; Jer. 1:10), *šā'â* hithpael (Isa. 41:23, but probably to be read as the qal of *šāṯāʿ*, "fear" [cf. Ugar. *ṯṯʿ*[26] and Phoen. *štʿ*[27]]), and *šāmar* (Ps. 37:37). *rā'â* is occasionally accompanied by a verb of seeking, such as *ḥāp̄aś* (2 K. 10:23) or *dāraš* (2 Ch. 24:22). Often used in parallel are → שׁמע *šāmaʿ* (e.g., Nu. 24:16; 1 S. 25:35; Isa. 6:9,10; Jer. 23:18; Ezk. 44:5; Ps. 45:11[10]; 48:9[8]; Job 13:1; Prov. 20:12) and → ידע *yāḏaʿ* (Gen. 18:21; Ex. 2:25; Lev. 5:1; Nu. 24:16-17; Dt. 4:35; 11:2; 1 S. 6:9; 18:28; 26:12; Isa. 5:19; 29:15; 44:9,18; 58:3; 61:9; Jer. 2:23; 5:1; 12:3; Ps. 31:8[7]; 138:6;[28] Job 11:11; Eccl. 6:5; Neh. 4:5[11]).

Naturally *rā'â* appears frequently in conjunction with → עין *ʿayin:* Gen. 45:12; Lev. 13:12; Nu. 11:6; Dt. 3:21,27; 4:3,9,12; 7:19; 10:21; 11:7; 21:7; 28:32,34,67; 29:2(3); Josh. 24:7; 1 S. 14:17; 16:7 (+ *l^e*; in parallel with → לב *lēḇ*); 2 S. 16:12*(Q)* (+ *b^e*); 24:3;

23. *NSS,* 151.
24. *HAL,* III, 207; Vetter, *THAT,* II, 692.
25. *IPN,* 186, 198.
26. *UT,* no. 2763.
27. *DISO,* 322.
28. J. Reider, *JBL* 66 (1947) 317.

1 K. 1:48; 10:7; 2 K. 7:2; 22:20; Isa. 6:5; 11:3; 17:7; 29:18; 30:20; 32:3; 33:15,17,20; 44:18; 64:3(4); Jer. 5:21; 20:4; 42:2; Ezk. 12:2,12; 23:16; 28:18; 40:4; 44:5; Mic. 7:10; Zec. 9:8; Mal. 1:5; Ps. 17:2; 35:21; 50:21; 54:9(7); 91:8; 94:9; 115:5; 135:16; 139:16; Job 7:7,8; 10:18; 13:1; 19:27; 20:9; 21:20*(Q);* 24:15; 28:7,10; 29:11; 42:5; Prov. 20:8,12; 22:12; 23:33; 25:7; Eccl. 5:10(11); 6:9; 11:7,9; Est. 2:15. To see with one's own eyes: Dt. 3:27; 29:3(4); 34:4; 1 S. 24:11(10); 2 K. 7:2,19; Zec. 9:8; Job 42:5; Ezr. 3:12; 2 Ch. 9:6; 29:8; 34:28; see eye to eye: Nu. 14:14; Isa. 52:8; Jer. 32:4; 34:3; with the connotation of seeing one's fill or gloating: Mic. 4:11; 7:10; Ps. 54:9(7); 92:12(11); Prov. 27:20; Eccl. 1:8; 4:8.

Among idiomatic expressions, we may note the following:

(a) *nś' 'ayin* + *wᵉr'h* (narrative or impv.): Gen. 13:10,14; 18:2; 22:4,13; 24:63,64; 31:10,12; 33:1,5; 37:25; 39:7; 43:29; Ex. 14:10; Nu. 24:2; Dt. 3:27; Josh. 5:13; Jgs. 19:17; 1 S. 6:13; 2 S. 13:34; 18:24; Isa. 40:26; 49:18; 51:6 (+ *nbṭ* hiphil); 60:4; Jer. 3:2; 13:20; Ezk. 8:5 (twice); Zec. 2:1,5 (1:18,22); 5:1,5,9; Job 2:12 (+ *nkr* hiphil); Dnl. 8:3; 10:5; 1 Ch. 21:16; followed by *wᵉhinnēh:* Gen. 39:7; Dt. 4:19; 2 K. 19:22 = Isa. 37:23; Ezk. 18:6,12,15; 23:27; 33:25; Ps. 121:1; 123:1.

(b) *wᵉ* + *r'h* (narrative or impv.) + *wᵉhinnēh:* Gen. 19:28; 22:13; 26:8; 29:2; 33:1; Dt. 9:16; Josh. 8:20; Jgs. 9:43; 2 S. 13:34; 2 K. 6:20; Jer. 4:25; Ezk. 1:4; 8:7; 2 Ch. 23:13.

(c) *hinnēh* + *r'h:* 1 S. 16:18; 21:15(14); 2 S. 18:10,11; 2 K. 7:2,19; 13:21; cf. *hinnēh* + suffix + *r'h:* 1 K. 22:25; Jer. 32:24; 2 Ch. 18:24.

(d) *lᵉḵû (û)rᵉ'û:* Josh. 2:1; 2 K. 6:13; 7:14; 10:16 (sg.); Jer. 7:12; Ps. 66:5.

(e) *da' ûrᵉ'ēh:* 1 S. 12:17; 14:38 (pl.); 23:22,23 (both pl.); 24:12(11); 25:17 (fem.); 2 S. 24:13; 1 K. 20:7 (pl.); Jer. 2:19 (fem.); 5:1 (pl.).

(f) *wayᵉhî kirᵉ'ōṯ:* Gen. 24:30; Josh. 8:14; Jgs. 11:35; 14:11; 1 K. 16:18; 18:17; 22:32,33; 2 K. 4:25; Jer. 41:13; cf. 39:4; Est. 5:2; Dnl. 8:2,15 (both *bᵉ*-); 2 Ch. 18:31,32.

(g) *rᵉ'ēh naṯattî:* Gen. 41:41; Ex. 7:1; Dt. 1:8,21; 2:24; 30:15; Ezk. 4:15; 1 Ch. 21:23; with *bᵉyāḏᵉḵā:* Josh. 6:2; 8:1; cf. Dt. 11:26; Josh. 23:4 (pl.).

(h) *rā'â pānîm:* Gen. 43:3,5; 44:23,26; 46:30; 48:11; Ex. 10:28,29; Jer. 52:25; Job 33:26; Est. 1:14; Dnl. 1:10; cf. *rā'â pānîm 'el-pānîm:* Gen. 32:31(30); Jgs. 6:22.

(i) Finally, there is the play on words *rā'â/yārē':* Isa. 41:5; Zec. 9:5; Ps. 40:4(3); 52:8(6); Job 6:21. Not rarely, however, the two verbs are simply confused: Jgs. 14:11; 1 K. 19:3; Isa. 41:23; Mic. 6:9; 2 Ch. 26:5.

3. *Everyday Usage.* a. Unlike other verbs referring to visual perception, *rā'â* denotes the experience of seeing as a totality, in which sensation and perception merge. The experience of the visual nature of reality has as its content the meaning, character, and nature of the images perceived; this experience is the polar opposite of sensation, i.e., the experience of the concrete nature of reality, an experience that conveys the nature and intensity of such sensory data as color, form, and spatial location. The verb *rā'â* refers particularly to that segment of the process that brings the perpetual flux of the visual experience of living reality to the level of conscious recognition — i.e., conscious perception or the act of comprehension. From the interplay of conscious perception and experience — i.e., the accumulation of remembered images and their meaning —

arises the faculty of visual and spatial orientation. In this process the seeing subject experiences a detachment from the perceived reality and is enabled to grasp this detachment perceptually, recognizing and appropriating it. The act of the recognition and the act of comprehension merge in a complex personal process that on both the linguistic and the textual level can be represented by *rā'â* but frequently is realized by the use of *rā'â* and *yāḏa'* in parallel (Nu. 24:16-17; Dt. 11:2; 1 S. 25:17; Isa. 29:15; 41:20; 44:9,18; 58:3; 61:9; Jer. 2:23; 5:1; 12:3; Ps. 138:6; Job 11:11; Eccl. 6:5; Neh. 4:5[11]). Not infrequently, a text accentuates the act of conscious perception as a way of obtaining knowledge (Gen. 18:21; Ex. 2:25; Dt. 4:35; 1 S. 6:9; 10:24; Isa. 5:19; Ps. 31:8[7]).

Sometimes the complexity of the personal process of perception is underscored by the juxtaposition of several verbs belonging to the lexical field "recognize, perceive," without distinguishable nuances of meaning.[29] The combinations *rā'â, śîm, yāḏa'* (Isa. 41:20); *bîn, rā'â, śāḵal* (44:18); *šāma', rā'â, bîn* (6:9); *rā'â, šāma', qāšaḇ, bîn* (32:3-4); and *šāma', ḥāzâ, rā'â, šûr* (Nu. 24:16) do not convey a purposeful differentiation of visual and noetic apperceptions, but instead express the totality of the human perceptual faculty.

Nevertheless, the visual faculty of the eyes remains constitutive for the apperception of the reality experienced distinct from the perceiving subject, as is clear from the frequent conjunction of *rā'â* with *'ayin* ("one's eyes see") or *bᵉ'ayin* ("see with one's eyes"). At the same time this usage emphasizes the personal nature of the visual experience. The personality of the individual is concentrated in the seeing eye. In the look of the eye is reflected the individual's present state as a change of situation, subjectively experienced and objectively recognizable. As the eyes dim, the aging individual perceives the ebbing of vigor and vitality and approach of the darkness of death (Gen. 27:1; 48:10; 1 S. 3:2; 4:15; 1 K. 14:4; in an allegorical sense: Eccl. 12:3), a situation in which the blind find themselves perpetually (Isa. 29:18). But the vision of healthy eyes can also be impaired. Drunkenness (Gen. 49:12), desire (Nu. 15:39), greed (Jer. 22:17), hubris and folly (Isa. 44:18) distort one's vision of reality. A universal limitation on the human perception of reality is noted in 1 S. 16:7: "Mortals see what is before their eyes," i.e., they are inclined to perceive only the outward form, not the true inner reality (cf. Isa. 11:3).

Hence the call for "enhanced vision" is expressed in a multitude of formulaic appeals.[30] A person or situation must be looked in the face and recognized. Observation of outward form with its initial apperceptions must be penetrated; the eye must be sharpened for a penetrating vision that comprehends reality. Such sharpened sight is the particular aim of the formulaic impv. *nś' 'yn + wᵉ-r'h,* "lift up your eyes and see." Vision turned in upon itself that concentrates on itself is to be freed from its egocentric shackles and be opened to whatever encounters it.

The early stories employ the narrative form of this idiom in an attenuated sense as a stylistic device to introduce a new episode (Gen. 13:10; 18:2; 22:4; 24:63; 33:1,5;

29. K. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja. BK* XI/1 (1989), 168-69.
30. See III.2 above.

43:29; cf. 8:13; 19:28; 40:6: *wayyar' w^e^hinnēh;* without *hnh:* 21:9; 28:6; 38:20). We find a similar usage in Ugaritic.[31]

The frequent parallelism of *rā'â* and *šāma'* in a wide variety of contexts confronts us with the question of the relationship between "see" and "hear." The nuances of each text must be examined individually. Here we shall deal only with the question whether "in early Hebrew tradition hearing takes undisputed priority over seeing and all other forms of sense perception."[32] Although the consensus favors this view,[33] it seems that this assumption is rooted more in the Aristotelian doctrine of the logos than in the OT tradition. According to Aristotle, the universality of the logos demands the priority of hearing over seeing. This postulate has been accepted by Western philosophy, as exemplified by Gadamer: "There is nothing that is not available to hearing through the medium of language. Whereas all the other senses have no immediate share in the universality of the verbal experience of the world, but only offer the key to their own specific fields, hearing is an avenue to the whole because it is able to listen to the logos."[34] This postulate effectively inspired the Christian theology of the Word. In the OT, too, the word plays an enormous role.[35] Clearly there are textual domains where the dominant notion is that of hearing the word, instruction, the law.[36] But when *rā'â* and *šāma'* occur together, the texts either refer to a unitary personal act of perception (Dt. 29:3[4]; Isa. 6:9ff.; Jer. 5:21; Prov. 20:12; Eccl. 1:8) or establish the priority of seeing over hearing (Gen. 45:27; 1 K. 10:7; Ps. 48:9[8]; Job 42:5). What is heard remains lifeless knowledge until the act of *rā'â* makes it a living experience that enriches life. In the latter case the knowledge conveyed by tradition *(šāma')* is not only corrected but shown to be a delusion by confrontation with reality *(rā'â).* In addition, the earlier traditions concerning encounters with God emphasize the priority of seeing over hearing.[37]

b. Every conscious apperception therefore is initiated by seeing with one's eyes. What is seen must be literally or figuratively "before one's eyes," fundamentally "visible" (1 K. 6:18; 8:8 = 2 Ch. 5:9; Job 32:1; Prov. 27:25; Cant. 2:12; Ezk. 19:11). The acts of apprehension generated by *rā'â* thus cover a broad and complex range of meanings. Global classification into two semantic groups is justifiable in that, besides the sensory visual aspect common to both, one group places more emphasis on the noetic aspect, the other on the emotional.

(1) Gen. 34:1 describes Dinah as setting out "to see the women of the region." She wants to go outside the confines of her seminomadic clan in order to *experience* the strange, fascinating life of the city. Elisha could see for himself that the people of Jericho lived well (2 K. 2:19). In the anecdotal passage 2 K. 2:19-22, this statement in the

---

31. L. R. Fisher, *RSP,* II, 133-52.
32. Kraus, 93, 94.
33. Most recently H. Schult, *THAT,* II, 978: "Prävalenz des Hörens vor dem Sehen in AT" (981).
34. H.-G. Gadamer, *Truth and Method* (Eng. trans. New York, 1989), 462.
35. → דבר *dāḇār.*
36. → שׁמע *šāma'.*
37. See III.5 below.

mouth of the men of the city functions to motivate Elisha to alleviate the only problem, the polluted spring. Jacob discovers that grain is available for purchase in Egypt (Gen. 42:1); Jonathan will inform David if he learns anything (1 S. 19:3). In both texts *rā'â* is synonymous with *šāma'*.

Close, careful seeing results in an *observation.* The reflection that takes place in the very act of perception results in knowledge *(rā'â* synonymous with *yāḏa').* Gen. 8:6-13 provides exemplary insight into this noetic development. Noah undertakes four attempts (vv. 6-9,10-11,12,13b) to master his desperate situation by sending forth a raven followed by three doves. In v. 8 he sends a dove to observe *(rā'â)* how high the water still is. When the second dove returns with an olive leaf in its beak, he knows *(yāḏa')* that the waters have subsided from the earth (v. 11). When the third dove fails to return, he opens the ark; he looks out, and sees the dry land extending before his eyes (v. 13). This sight gives him a final assurance of deliverance *(wayyar' wᵉhinnēh).*

The other noetic acts probably took place in a similar way. When Sarah sees the son of Hagar playing (Gen. 21:9), she mentally pictures the ensuing course of events; she recognizes the consequences and the need to take action (cf. Gen. 24:30; 30:1,9; 37:4; 1 S. 18:28; Est. 7:7). Joseph's brothers see that their father is dead (Gen. 50:15) — i.e., they become aware[38] what Jacob's death could mean for them: Joseph's vengeance (cf. 31:5; 39:3). When Lot emerges from his thoughts and considers Abraham's proposal (13:8-9), he lifts his eyes and sees before him the whole well-watered plain of the Jordan (v. 10). A stroke of genius captures the entire psychological process of pondering and deciding in an act of observation.

Observation of concrete circumstances and events brings knowledge and certainty. From Saul's behavior, David recognizes that his death has been settled on definitively (1 S. 23:15; emendation to *yārē'* is unnecessary[39]). The inhabitants of Ashdod see the judgment that has befallen them and recognize its source (1 S. 5:7). After many attempts, in Jgs. 16:18 Delilah realizes that she knows the whole secret of the naziriteship.

All the same, outward appearances can deceive, because they may be designed to delude. Thus David plays the madman in the presence of Achish in order to avoid possible danger (1 S. 21:14[13]). Achish appears to see through David's maneuver (vv. 15-16[14-15]; here too emendation to *yārē'* is inappropriate), but clearly has no interest in getting involved in the dispute between David and Saul. Simple acts of observation are referred to in Isa. 22:9 (breaches in the wall of the city of David; cf. 2 S. 5:7,9; 1 K. 2:10); 2 K. 12:11(10) = 2 Ch. 24:11 (money in a chest); cf. Ex. 8:11(15); 32:1; 1 S. 28:21; Dnl. 1:13 (course of action determined by what one observes; cf. Est. 2:9).

Careful weighing of circumstances may ripen into a plan that is in fact carried out. According to 1 S. 25:17, Abigail considers carefully how to avert the evil occasioned by her husband's ill-natured conduct toward David (25:32ff.). Facing an imminent attack by the Arameans, Ahab is to gather his forces and work out a sound strategy (1 K.

38. J. Skinner, *Genesis. ICC:* "realize."

39. H. J. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuels. KAT* VIII/1 (1973), 424.

20:22). Gad tells David to consider carefully his response to the word of Yahweh (2 S. 24:13; cf. 2 Ch. 21:12). Ps. 66:18 speaks in general terms of "planning evil" (the emendation *rā'îṯî* to *'āmartî* is unnecessary[40]).

The queen of Sheba had heard of Solomon's wisdom and prosperity. Observing them with her own eyes, she is convinced and persuaded that the reports are true (1 K. 10:4,7 = 2 Ch. 9:3,6). In 2 K. 10:23 Jehu commands the worshipers of Baal to "make certain" that they are alone in the temple, i.e., that they are not in danger. They find out at once that this is a ruse — at least as presented by the redactor of vv. 18-27. Joseph's death, as plotted by his brothers, is intended to demonstrate that his ambitious ideas are empty dreams: "Then we shall see what will become of his dreams" (Gen. 37:20).

Joseph counsels Pharaoh to "select" a man who is discerning and wise, and set him over the land of Egypt to avert the consequences of the impending famine (Gen. 41:33, E). Saul orders his servants to find a young and talented musician, whose playing will alleviate Saul's illness (1 S. 16:17). In a diplomatic trick Jehu tells the Samaritan nobility to select the best qualified of Ahab's sons and make him king (2 K. 10:3). Esther is provided with seven chosen maids from the king's palace (Est. 2:9). In the so-called Blessing of Moses (Dt. 33), the saying concerning Gad states that he chose the best of the spoil for himself, i.e., the leader's portion (v. 21).

The verb *rā'â* can mean either an intentional search that accomplishes its purpose or a chance discovery. Jgs. 5:8 merely states an observed fact: "Shield and spear were seen no longer among forty thousand in Israel." Joseph has his brothers' money hidden in their sacks of grain. As they are traveling, one of them discovers it; back at home, they all do. They realize *(rā'â)* at once the possible consequences and are dismayed *(yārē')* (Gen. 42:27,35). At the behest of the lords of the Philistines, Delilah attempts to discover the secret of Samson's strength (Jgs. 16:5). Saul and his servant go in search of their donkeys, but cannot find them anywhere (1 S. 10:14). In a remarkable construct of Levitical priestly phantasy embodied in Ezk. 39:11-16, a permanent commission is to scour the defiled land for human remains and set up a sign by any they find (v. 15).

In Gen. 29:2 (J) Jacob comes upon a well in the open countryside. What Jacob sees is not just a physical object; the well near the city is in fact the natural meeting place for shepherds and merchants. In Gen. 22:4, after three days Abraham lifts up his eyes and sees far away the place where he will be tested. For the structure of the narrative in Gen. 22, the trajectory that begins with the command of Elohim (v. 2), takes shape in Abraham's silent departure for an unknown destination (v. 3), and culminates in the sight of that destination is a means of drawing the listener into the dramatic situation.

Quite commonly, *rā'â* can refer to an encounter between two individuals. In Gen. 24:64 Rebekah lifts up her eyes and sees Isaac. In this lapidary statement the depth of a meeting of two lovers finds expression; cf. Gen. 29:10: the meeting of Jacob and Rachel, a case of "love at first sight," lends it extraordinary power. In Cant. 3:3 the bride, who is looking for her beloved, asks: "Have you seen him whom my soul loves?" Ac-

40. Contra H. Gunkel, *Psalmen. HKAT* II/2 (⁵1968), 279; *et al.*

cording to Ex. 4:14, Aaron's heart will be glad when he sees his brother Moses. A priestly Levitical tradent was able to use Moses' refusal to accept Yahweh's commission as a device to introduce the figure of Aaron (vv. 14b-17). Less gratifying is the encounter of Ahab and Elijah (1 K. 18:17). We are told that Samuel never saw Saul again until the day of his death (1 S. 15:35).

A reunion is the subject of Gen. 44:28; 45:28; 48:11. Jacob/Israel, believing that Joseph had died, laments that he has not seen him since he left. The assurance that Joseph is still alive gives the old man the strength to undertake the long journey to Egypt, where they are reunited. In 1 S. 20:29, under the pretext of seeing his brother again, David avoids coming to Saul's feast. On the use of the expression "see one's homeland no more," see Jer. 42:18 and the later interpretation in 22:10,12.

Illness can be a particular reason to visit someone. Ahaziah of Judah visits his cousin Joram, wounded at Ramoth-gilead, in Jezreel (2 K. 8:29 = 2 Ch. 22:6; cf. 2 K. 9:16). Visits of this nature can sometimes be a torture for the sufferer (Ps. 41:7[6]; cf. Job 2:11ff.).

The full immediacy of personal encounter finds expression in the formula "see someone's face": "Israel said to Joseph, 'I can die now, having seen your face again and knowing that you are still alive'" (Gen. 46:30). Contrariwise, Jacob has every reason to fear a face-to-face encounter with his brother. Therefore he sends a flock ahead as a gift of appeasement, in the hope that at the moment of meeting his brother will show him mercy and accept him (Gen. 32:21[20]; cf. 31:2). In sum, the semantic complex "meet, encounter," clearly marks a transition to great emphasis on the emotional aspect.

(2) In Ex. 2:11, when Moses goes out to visit his people, he is moved by observation of their forced labor *(rā'â bᵉ)*. When he is forced to watch the mistreatment of another Hebrew, he kills the Egyptian overseer. In 18:14 Moses' father-in-law observes that Moses is totally overwhelmed with the mediation of God's decisions to the people (the communication of God's statutes and instructions [v. 16] is a Dtr addition), and advises him to appoint officers (vv. 21-22).

The servants of Eglon "discover" that the doors of his upper chamber are locked and draw a false conclusion (Jgs. 3:24). Abimelech discovers by accident that Rebekah is Isaac's wife and that Isaac has deceived him (Gen. 26:8). When the Ammonites notice that they have become odious to David, they mobilize their forces (2 S. 10:6 = 1 Ch. 19:6). Overhearing the whispering of his servants, David learns that his child is dead (2 S. 12:19). Michal despises David when she spots him leaping and dancing before the ark (2 S. 6:16). As soon as Hagar realizes that she is pregnant, she feels like a second wife and treats Sarai with contempt (Gen. 16:4-5). Tamar realizes that she has been denied the right of progeny through levirate marriage (38:14). According to 28:6-9 (P), Esau realizes that Jacob has been blessed by Isaac. In his mind he associates this blessing with Jacob's obedience. At the same time he sees his own treatment of his father as unjust. P uses this passage to hold up Esau also to the postexilic community as a model of obedience.

By chance, Pharaoh's daughter notices a basket among the reeds, which immediately arouses her curiosity (Ex. 2:5); she is astonished to find a crying infant in it (v. 6). Breathing a sigh of relief, Jacob has scarcely named the site of his nocturnal struggle

(Gen. 32:31; secondary) when he notices Esau approaching with a large crowd of people (33:1, J). Among the members of Jacob's household, Esau initially sees just his brother and makes his peace with him. Only then does he look up and see the others, including them in his gesture of friendship (33:5). Joseph's brothers look up and see a caravan (37:25). Isaac looks up from his work and sees camels — a veiled way of saying that he sees Rebekah (24:63). One evening an old man living in Gibeah as an alien notices a wayfarer at the village well; he asks where he comes from and where he is going, and brings him to his house (Jgs. 19:17). But such emotionally charged vision can also deceive. Samuel is profoundly impressed by the sight of Eliab and believes that he is to be Yahweh's anointed (1 S. 16:6). However, Yahweh, who sees not outward appearances but the heart (v. 7), has chosen another.

As a personal act *rā'â* runs the entire gamut of emotional affect, usually without specific context classifiers. Such usage is generally indicated by the use of *bᵉ* to introduce the object. The sexual contexts, in which *rā'â* reaches its goal in *yāḏa'*, stand clearly in the foreground. They range from mere carnal satisfaction to personal love. Judah (Gen. 38:15) and Samson (Jgs. 16:1) see prostitutes and go in to them. Shechem sees Dinah and takes her by force (Gen. 34:2). From the flat roof of his palace, David sees Bathsheba bathing and orders her brought to him (2 S. 11:2). Potiphar's wife casts a lustful eye on Joseph and asks him to lie with her (Gen. 39:7). The historical allegory in Ezk. 23 pictures Israel as two lecherous sisters. The mere sight of pictures of magnificent warriors is enough to arouse Oholibah's lust (v. 14). Delight in feminine grace and beauty is reflected in Est. 2:15 ("Esther was admired by all who saw her") and Cant. 6:9 ("the maidens saw her and extolled her"; cf. Gen. 12:12-15). Drawing on the motif of an orchard, Cant. 6:11 (cf. 7:13[12]) describes metaphorically the delights of "experiencing the feminine in the act of sexual intimacy."[41] Sight that evokes love and leads to marriage is apparent in Gen. 38:2: Judah sees Shua, the daughter of a Canaanite, and takes her as his wife (cf. Jgs. 14:1-2).

Seeing can also involve the desire to enjoy something. In a taunt song mocking images made by human hands (Isa. 44:9-20), the poet employs satirical contrast between two ways of using wood: the material from which an artisan fashions an idol to worship serves as fuel for cooking and heating: "Ah, I am warm, I can see [= feel] the fire" (v. 16). A metaphorical threat against the "garland of Ephraim" (28:1-4) uses the image of a first-ripe fig to represent its sudden end: whoever sees it eats it up as soon as it comes to hand (v. 4).

Gen. 3:6 belongs in a different context. It is not simply "the delightful, attractive fruit that draws one to bite it";[42] the driving force is the fundamental human longing for an expanded life and an enhanced existence.

Delight in what one sees can include an element of malice when the misfortune of others is involved, as in Lam. 1:7: "The foe looked on mocking over her downfall" (cf.

---

41. G. Krinetzki, *Hoheslied. NEB* 2 (1985), contra W. Rudolph, *Hohelied. KAT* XVII/1-3 (1962), 166.

42. C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1984), 249.

Ob. 12-13). According to Mic. 7:8-20, Jerusalem will gloat over the downfall of her enemy (v. 10). Ezk. 28:17 describes the fall of the king of Tyre: he is now in the underworld, where the kings who formerly flattered him feast their eyes on him. In Ps. 22:8(7) the psalmist laments: "All who see me mock at me." His suffering is aggravated by the malicious pleasure of others (cf. 109:25).

At other times, the sight of misfortune provokes the opposite reaction, horror and flight (Ps. 21:13[12]; cf. Nah. 3:7); empathic suffering is also possible (Est. 8:6; cf. Dt. 28:32; in response to the fate of an individual: Gen. 21:16; 44:34). This leads to a universal appeal to share in the suffering and pain of Jerusalem (Lam. 1:12,18).

Finally, seeing can involve pleasure and delight. According to 2 K. 16:10, the altar that Ahaz saw in Damascus pleased him so that he had a new altar built in Jerusalem to the same specifications and the old one removed (v. 14, a late gloss): a highly tendentious description of the religious consequences of vassalage! With grateful delight David sees the generosity of the people in contributing to the building of the temple (1 Ch. 29:17).

Not rarely the sight of misfortune has an aura of sensationalism that evokes gawking. In Jgs. 16:24 the people gawk at Samson as he is led before them. In 2 S. 20:12 the people stand in the street to gawk at the body of Amasa (cf. 1 K. 13:25). In Ps. 22:18(17) the psalmist complains of being surrounded by a gawking rabble who gloat over his suffering.

The need to see is matched by a corresponding need to show (*rā'â* hiphil). The showing of the fruit of the land to Moses and the whole congregation of the Israelites is meant to persuade them of the fertility of the promised land, as well as to substantiate the report of the spies (Nu. 13:26). Jael proudly shows Barak the body of Sisera, whom she has just slain (Jgs. 4:22). The simple desire to impress impels Hezekiah to show all his wealth to the Babylonian envoys (2 K. 20:13,15 = Isa. 39:2,4). The same desire, even more exaggerated, motivates Artaxerxes (Est. 1:4,11).

Jacob sends Joseph to his brothers to see (= find out) whether it is well with them (Gen. 37:14). At the behest of the chief jailer, Joseph takes care of everything that goes on in the prison, so that the jailer does not need to look after anything (39:23). Out of concern for Amnon, who is pretending to be sick, David agrees to his malicious request (2 S. 13:5-6). The meaning of 1 K. 12:16 = 2 Ch. 10:16 is ambiguous: "Look now to your own house, O David." Emendation to *r^eʿēh*, with LXX, is no improvement. It remains an open question whether the words are to be understood as malicious mockery ("See what has become of your political dreams!") or irony ("Enjoy your house!"), or in the sense of "Look after your affairs!"

Finally, *rā'â* can express an apperception that puts its stamp on a person's fundamental being, an "experience." The nature of the experience varies widely, depending on the nature and form of the reality experienced.

Moses threatens Pharaoh with a plague of locusts, a disaster the likes of which no one in Egypt has ever experienced (Ex. 10:6). Pashhur threatens Jeremiah with having to see the death of his friends by the sword of their enemies (Jer. 20:4). Jerusalem was forced to experience the desecration of the temple (Lam. 1:10). Every day, those returning from exile experience personally the extent of Jerusalem's destruction and mis-

ery (Neh. 2:17) — thus the warning against seeking refuge in a supposedly better past, fleeing to Egypt where the people did not see war and misfortune (Jer. 42:14; 44:17 [both Dtr]; cf. Ex. 13:17). The tribal saying in Gen. 49:14-15 describes Issachar as avoiding military conflicts (but cf. Jgs. 5:15), preferring forced labor and generally enjoying ("seeing") the rest and beauty of his ancestral land.

To "see good" *(rā'â ṭôḇ* or *ṭôḇâ)* means to experience happiness, to live a meaningful life; this experience has been totally lost to the poet of Job 7:7 (*rā'â* with "my eye" as subj.) and 9:25 (*rā'â* with "my days" as subj.). Now that he knows how vulnerable he is, doubt and dread dominate his very being. Eliphaz remonstrates that this is why Job can no longer see the light of happiness but only the darkness of his misery (22:11, preferring MT to LXX). Similar is the perplexed question cited in Ps. 4:7(6): "Who will let us see any good?" The failure of Jeremiah's prophetic mission leads him to question the meaning of his life, which is destined only to experience toil and sorrow (Jer. 20:18).

A happy life, contrariwise, is expressed by the traditional idiom "see one's offspring" (Gen. 50:23; Job 42:16). Isa. 53:10 uses this expression to describe the consequences of God's restorative act in the person of the Servant. According to Ps. 128:6, in his children's children the person being blessed will experience enduring happiness beyond the limits of his own life. David is happy to be allowed to see one of his offspring on the throne, guaranteeing the endurance of his house (1 K. 1:48).

(3) Light and sun are metaphors representing life and happiness. To see "light" (Isa. 53:11 [reading with 1QIs^{a,b} and LXX]; Job 33:28; Ps. 36:10[9]) or "the sun" (Eccl. 7:11; 11:7) means to live, to enjoy a happy life. This idiom is common in the various Semitic languages (cf. Akk. *amāru šamaš/nūra*[43]); there is accordingly no need for Lohfink's theory that here a standard Greek idiom since the time of Homer has invaded the Semitic realm.[44] According to Eccl. 11:7, doing what one is able to do at any given time brings a life of "moderate" happiness. Wisdom benefits only the living (Eccl. 7:11). After the darkness of anguish, the Servant of Yahweh will see light — i.e., experience a life of happiness (Isa. 53:11). Life is vouchsafed by God (Job 33:28); in the radiance of God's *kāḇôḏ* as the fountain of life, human life acquires meaning and stability (Ps. 36:10[9]; cf. Isa. 9:1[2]).

When negated, the same idiom means "die." Even the happy and rich must go down to the company of their ancestors, "who will never again see the light" (Ps. 49:20[19]). A stillborn child, who "has not seen the sun" (Eccl. 6:5; cf. Ps. 58:9[8] with *ḥāzâ*) or "never sees the light" (Job 3:16), has no life or identity, but does enjoy the rest that has its particular attraction for each author. Eccl. 12:3 speaks metaphorically of death: "when the women [= the eyes] that look through the window see dimly." To see "the gates of deep darkness" (Job 38:17,22), "the Pit" (Ps. 16:10; 49:10[9]), or "death" itself (Ps. 89:49[48]) means explicitly to die.

---

43. See II.3 above.

44. N. Lohfink, *Qoheleth* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 2003); cf. H. W. Hertzberg, *Prediger. KAT* XVII/4-5 (1963), 139.

4. *Specialized Usage.* In certain areas of life, "enhanced vision" — attentive observation and correct interpretation of actions and circumstances — is of particular importance and can be linked with certain offices and functions. The idioms and expressions of everyday language here take on specific nuances, occasionally becoming technical terms.

a. *Military Contexts.* Many texts naturally are set in military contexts. (1) A necessary condition for military success is accurate intelligence about the terrain and the enemy. As a rule this is provided by experienced scouts or spies (Nu. 13:18; Josh. 2:1; 1 S. 14:16; 2 K. 7:13-14; cf. Gen. 42:9,12, where Joseph accuses his brothers of espionage, and Nu. 32:8-9, a late redactional addition). No actual reports of spies have been preserved. Nu. 13:28(J?),32-33(P); Dt. 1:28; Jgs. 18:9 (Dtr?) are late fabrications. Occasionally collaborators or informers supply important intelligence: in Jgs. 1:24-25 an inhabitant of Bethel shows the spies of the house of Joseph the way into the city. In 1 S. 22:9 the Edomite Doeg denounces Ahimelech to Saul for offering David refuge (cf. 2 S. 17:18). Not just foreign enemies but domestic political opponents can be the target of spies (1 S. 23:23; 2 K. 6:13). David spies on Saul and his encampment (1 S. 26:5).

The success or failure of a military action depends decisively on a correct reading of the situation, which determines strategy and tactics (Josh. 8:21; Jgs. 9:43; 2 S. 10:9 = 1 Ch. 19:10; 2 Ch. 32:3; misreading: Josh. 8:14; Jgs. 9:36; 1 K. 22:32-33 = 2 Ch. 18:31-32; a transgression on the part of Israel: 1 S. 12:12 [Dtr]). In 1 S. 14:17 Saul checks carefully to determine which of his troops have deserted. In 1 S. 13:11 Saul uses his observations of the situation to justify his sacrifice of the burnt offering before Samuel's arrival.

In the face of imminent defeat, flight is often the last chance (Josh. 8:20; Jgs. 20:36; 1 S. 13:6; 17:51; 1 K. 16:18; 2 K. 3:26; 9:27; Jer. 39:4). The mere sight of a superior enemy can arouse consternation and terror (1 S. 17:25; 18:15), resulting in panicked flight (1 S. 17:24; 31:7 = 1 Ch. 10:7; 2 K. 13:21). This situation lies behind the military exhortation of Dt. 20:1-9, which demands fearlessness (v. 1). Sight of the Egyptians lying dead on the seashore shows the Israelites that they are out of danger (Ex. 14:30; cf. v. 13). When they catch sight of their pursuers, the people whom Ishmael has taken from Mizpah against their will are glad to see their chance for deliverance and go over to Johanan (Jer. 41:13).

(2) It is the duty of a sentinel *(ṣōp̱eh)* to recognize approaching danger early and sound the alarm. In a fortified town the sentinel's post is on the gate tower, which commands the best view (2 S. 18:24-27; 2 K. 9:17). The vigilant sentinel becomes a commonplace in narrative and prophetic literature; this usage probably explains why the words of sentinels are recorded, in contrast to reports of spies (2 S. 18:25-27; 2 K. 9:17; Hab. 2:1ff.). The sentries of a military camp do not have this as their regular duty, but are detailed as necessary (Jgs. 1:24; 2 S. 13:34).

(3) In 1 S. 17:28 Eliab accuses David of looking for a fight to make a name for himself. The Philistine looks at David with disdain when he confronts him (1 S. 17:42). Rudolph is probably correct in emending 2 K. 23:29, "when he [= Pharaoh] saw him," to "when he [= Josiah] challenged him to battle."[45] Amaziah's demand that Joash meet

45. W. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher. HAT* XXI (1955), 333.

him in battle (2 K. 14:8,11 = 2 Ch. 25:17,21) formally resembles a challenge to single combat.

(4) In 1 S. 14:52 Saul recruits every strong and valiant warrior. Nehemiah inspects his militia (Neh. 4:8[14]; there is no need for the emendation *yārē'*).

b. *At Court.* (1) "Seeing the king" or "seeing the face of the king" is a formula used by the language of the court to refer to admittance to the king's presence for an audience. Never is a meeting with the king devoid of danger (1 K. 18:1-2,15: Elijah and Ahab; cf. 1 S. 25:23; 2 S. 24:20; 2 K. 11:14 = 2 Ch. 23:13; Jer. 32:4; 34:3). The granting of an audience can require that certain conditions be met (Gen. 43:3,5; 44:23,26; 2 S. 3:13).

A person who has fallen into disfavor will be refused audience. In Ex. 10:28-29 Pharaoh forbids Moses, upon pain of death, ever to see his face again. After his attack on Amnon, Absalom tries in vain for two years to have an audience with the king (2 S. 14:24,28,32).

The expression "those who see the face of the king" (NRSV "the king's council") refers to a special group of court officials, reflecting a form of privileged service of a particularly personal nature (2 K. 25:19; Jer. 52:25; Est. 1:14). In the Persian Empire seven such privileged officials sit first in the king's council.

(2) For the king to see and take notice of a person is a mark of special favor (Gen. 43:16,29), which can result in that person's entering into the king's service (Gen. 41:33; 1 K. 11:28). Gen. 46:29 describes the moment that Joseph meets his father with the words "when he appeared before him." Many exegetes take exception to this expression and emend the text to read "when he saw him."[46] But we are dealing here with a courtly idiom, and emendation is unnecessary.[47]

c. *Legal Contexts.* The verb *rā'â* is well established in legal language.

(1) The showing of the land (Dt. 34:1) and the command to see the land (Gen. 13:14; Nu. 27:12; Dt. 3:27; 32:49) go back to ancient legal conceptions. The language reflects a legal action that accomplished the conveyance of the land in question. When the person invited to see the land does so, it becomes that person's legal property (Nu. 32:1). This procedure admits the possibility of rejection because of displeasure with what is seen (1 K. 9:12). The imperative in Jer. 40:4 is to be understood as offering a free choice of residence.

This legal concept in its entirety has been incorporated into the language embodying God's promise of the land. When God commands Abraham to raise his eyes and look upon the land surrounding him (Gen. 13:14), the promise (v. 15) is already made good and ownership of the land has been established. Contrariwise, "not one of this evil generation shall see the good land" (Dt. 1:35; cf. Nu. 14:23; 32:11 — except for Caleb: Dt. 1:36). Moses hopes for and expects from Yahweh a treatment different from that accorded the faithless Israelites who perished in the wilderness, but Yahweh rejects his

46. EÜ; J. Scharbert, *Genesis. NEB* (1985), 280, following Westermann et al. Cf. G. von Rad, *Genesis. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1961), 398, who calls it "suspicious"; Westermann, *Genesis 37–50* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1986), 162: "impossible."

47. H. Holzinger, *KHC* I, 249: "He meets him first in the role of a high official."

request to take personal possession of the land (Dt. 3:25-26). Insofar as he is (still) the representative of the people, he is allowed to take possession of the land on their behalf ("see from afar"); but he himself will receive no portion in it (v. 27; cf. 32:49-50; Nu. 27:12-13).

(2) Not rarely, the command to see is combined with a formulaic expression conveying ownership of things and persons or appointment to office. "See, I have set the land before you" (Dt. 1:8; cf. 1:21; 2:24,31; Josh. 6:2; 8:1; 23:4). The texts cited incorporate this entire juridical conveyancing formula into the words spoken by God. It gives voice to the sovereignty of God's own decision as a personal act, which involved the person addressed in a free act of personal decision.

"See, I have set you over all the land of Egypt" (Gen. 41:41). With this formula Pharaoh performs the official act of appointing Joseph vizier. The words of address express a special relationship of trust. Joseph is made not just the chief of staff of the palace but the representative of Pharaoh, his "image." One may compare Jer. 1:10, where Yahweh speaking in the first person appoints Jeremiah prophet to the nations; Ex. 7:1, where Moses is made like God to Pharaoh; Ex. 31:2; 35:30: according to P, Yahweh himself commissioned Bezalel to fashion the cultic furnishings of the sanctuary.

(3) Nu. 35:16-29 is a collection of regulations governing asylum. V. 23 deals with the case of unintentional homicide: "If he [the perpetrator], without seeing him, causes a stone that could cause death to fall on someone. . . ."

Ex. 22:6-14(7-15) deals with property deposited for safekeeping with a neighbor. When an animal is left (v. 9a[10a]), the situation is treated according to the general guidelines of the original compilation (vv. 6,7aα,9a,11-14a[7,8aα,10a,12-15a]). The special case treated in v. 9b(10b) (when there is no witness to support the innocence of the holder if a claim is brought by the depositor) belongs to the redactional stratum vv. 7bβ,8,9b,10 (8β,9,10b,11) and is governed by the comprehensive guidelines of 22:6-14(7-15).

Ex. 23:4-5 demands assistance "when you see the donkey of your enemy collapsed under its burden" (cf. Dt. 22:1-3,4). This requirement lies at the heart of the chiastically structured compilation of laws in 23:1-3,6-8, which has been set in the theological framework of 22:19-20 and 23:10-12. The requirement to help an enemy is not a judicially enforceable law but an ethical claim. The case itself is nothing more than a paradigm for an attitude of solidarity that overcomes even enmity, ultimately rooted in the mercy of Yahweh.

The ritual, of ancient origin, used to purge a town of bloodguilt when a murder by an unknown hand is discovered (Dt. 21:1-9), requires the elders to affirm their innocence: "Our hands did not shed this blood, nor did our eyes witness it" (v. 7). Besides bloodguilt, sexual transgressions can render a town and its surrounding region unclean. Therefore Lev. 20:17 requires that a man who sees the nakedness of (i.e., has sexual intercourse with) his sister be cut off. Ham's seeing the nakedness of his father (Gen. 9:22) seriously dishonors his parent, an offense punishable by death (Ex. 21:17; Lev. 20:9) or a curse (Dt. 27:16). Public exposure of someone's genitalia is a particular disgrace, often inflicted on defeated enemies (2 S. 10:4-5; Isa. 20:2-4); prophetic judgment oracles announce it as a punishment for Israel (Jer.

13:26; Ezk. 16:37; Hos. 2:5[2:3]; cf. Lam. 1:8), Babylon (Isa. 47:3), and Nineveh (Nah. 3:5).

(4) Used as a technical forensic term, *rā'â* means "bear witness to" or "look upon (as evidence)." According to Lev. 5:1, it is a sin for someone who has seen or learned of a matter not to fulfill the obligation to speak up after public adjuration. Prov. 25:7c-8 cautions against hasty litigation: one should not bring before the court every trifle that one witnesses; trivial matters should be settled out of court.

In court, evidence may be presented or facts brought to light, if need be with the help of witnesses. In the action involving Saul and David (1 S. 24:10-16), the focus is on the physical evidence. When Saul sees the corner of his cloak, which David produces, his own eyes convince him of David's innocence. In 1 S. 26:16 the emphasis is on the demand to acknowledge an obvious state of affairs (cf. 1 S. 24:12[11]; Jer. 2:10-12,29-35). The expression "our eyes have seen" (Ps. 35:21) is a standard forensic rhetorical formula, used by witnesses to affirm their testimony. We may conjecture that Dt. 33:9 and Job 8:18 reflect an archaic legal formula, the forensic nature of which is nevertheless debatable. In Job 29:11 the speaker appeals to the witness of the widows and orphans he has helped.

The presentation of evidence can be followed by a proposal for settlement, occasionally introduced by the imperative of *rā'â* (1 S. 12:13). In Ps. 64:6(5) and Isa. 29:15 (cf. Isa. 47:10), the wicked express their belief that their machinations will remain concealed and thus escape punishment: "Who can see us?"

The legal parenesis of Deuteronomy uses an evidentiary schema that developed out of the covenant formulary under the influence of the legal language used before and during judicial proceedings. The use and meaning of *rā'â* follow this schema.

The first part of this schema, the so-called past history, refers constantly to Yahweh's great deeds in the past, which the people saw with their own eyes *(rā'â)* and remember *(zkr)*. In Dt. 11:2b-7 *rā'â* appears in the frame surrounding the prehistory. In 29:1b(2b) *rā'â* introduces the past history (vv. 1b-8[2b-9]), which probably has cultic roots; it reappears in vv. 2a(3a) and 3b(4b). In Dt. 4:32-40 the theme of Israel's past is developed in the form of a rhetorical question, tracing it back to creation. The question concludes with the catchword "eyes" (v. 34). V. 35 proceeds to a confessional formula introduced by *yāḏa'*. In the words of Moses cited in 1:29-31, *rā'â* (v. 31) refers back to the people's personal experience as eyewitnesses (cf. 1:19; 3:21; 4:3,9; 7:19; 10:21; Ex. 19:4 [post-Dtr]).

The confessional conclusion, the second part of the schema, is usually introduced by *yāḏa'* but occasionally by *rā'â:* "See now: I, even I, am he; there is no god beside me" (Dt. 32:39; cf. 28:10; 29:21[22]). In Dtn usage *rā'â* signals that those addressed are to experience in the present Yahweh's great deeds of the past, as being vital and binding in their own lives; they are to enter into a personal relationship with this God who acts in the present, thus becoming unshakable eyewitnesses of Yahweh's mighty acts. This witness is to inform the way they walk with God and with their neighbors.

d. *Wisdom.* (1) It is the function of practical wisdom to observe carefully the multitudinous phenomena of the natural and human realms, to discern the regular sequences and structures within this variety, and on the basis of this knowledge to formulate rules

of conduct and guiding principles that are prudent and teachable as counsel or advice. Countless individual observations and experiences thus coalesce to form the informed knowledge of a society. This process presupposes the identity of the natural and noetic orders as well as the convertibility of individual and collective experience. Hence the many appeals to individual observation and experience, which confirm the practical wisdom inculcated by the teacher (Prov. 6:6; 23:31; Ps. 119:37; Jer. 6:16). Against the background of collective experience, individual observation becomes the cornerstone of sapiential instruction (Prov. 7:7; Ps. 37:25,35; Job 4:8; 5:3).

Of course not everything merits the same attention (Prov. 23:31; Ps. 119:37); some things cloud human judgment, so that "the eyes see strange things" (Prov. 23:33). Furthermore, "whoever stands staring at the clouds will not reap" (Eccl. 11:4) — i.e., undue and overscrupulous observation so as always to be on the safe side results in neglect of possible and necessary action. Proverbial wisdom, despite its optimistic belief in achieving a successful life through insight and knowledge, is well aware of its limits (Prov. 26:12; Ps. 119:96); it does not, however, reflect on these limits in the manner of Eccl. 11:4.

This holds true particularly for the highly sensitive axiom that a person's fate and fortune evolve directly from his or her actions or behavior, which constitutes the foundation of the sapiential way of life. The validity of this principle is asserted on the basis of general experience and personal observation (Prov. 29:16; Ps. 37:25,35; Job 4:8; 5:3; 20:17; 21:20); the reasoning is remarkably circular (esp. in Job 4:8). Here wisdom reaches its limit (Job 13:1), which it transcends in faith in Yahweh (Ps. 73:3; Job 22:19). The particular contradictions of life are grounded and transcended in the inscrutability of God's plan (Job 35:5; cf. 9:11; Jer. 23:18). True insight and knowledge are thus ultimately gifts vouchsafed by Yahweh (Prov. 20:12). The sapiential question, "Which of you desires life, and covets many days to enjoy good?" (Ps. 34:13[12]), practical wisdom answers from the perspective of faith: true happiness comes to those who fear Yahweh (v. 12[11], with play on *rā'â/yārē'*).

(2) Ecclesiastes uses *rā'â* with notable frequency, albeit with a clear shift in meaning when compared to the usage of proverbial wisdom. Ecclesiastes starts with the generally acknowledged limitations of human perception and grasp of reality: "The eye is not satisfied with seeing" (1:8). The limit is defined by "under the sun." Knowledge is restricted in principle to this world; insight into the beyond is out of the question — not to mention knowledge of God.

Even "under the sun," however, it only appears that knowledge achieves its goal, since mortals can grasp reality only in the present moment. There can be no continuous advance of knowledge. The joyous discovery, "See, this is new" (1:10), has its apparent justification only in human forgetfulness. Starting from this limit, Ecclesiastes radically examines all that traditional wisdom extols as promising "gain" (1:3). In passages like 1:14; 2:13,24; 3:10,16,22; 4:4,15; 5:12,17(13,18); 6:1; 7:15; 8:9,10,17; 9:13; 10:5,7, *rā'â* refers not to communication of one's own observations and experience but to critical analysis of what claims to be knowledge based on collective experience, to determine the validity of this claim. Even the first-person accounts in 1:12–2:11 do not record personal experience; in a travesty of Solomon they present the speaker engaged

in his critical analysis of knowledge. The bottom line: the absurdity of human striving for knowledge as a way to achieve a meaningful life and enduring happiness leaves as "gain" only the enjoyment of the pleasures offered by the fleeting moment (9:9: *rā'â ḥayyîm;* cf. *rā'â (bᵉ)ṭôḇ* in 2:1,24 [hiphil]; 3:13; 5:17[18]).

e. *Cult.* (1) One of the functions of the priesthood is to distinguish what is clean from what is unclean (Lev. 10:10). This decision is based on careful examination of the object or situation, for which Lev. 13–14 alone uses *rā'â* 34 times.

These chapters comprise an exilic summary (13:2-46; 14:2-8) of early practice (cf. Dt. 24:8-9; 2 K. 7:3) with exilic and postexilic expansions (14:9-20; 13:47-59; 14:33-53; very late: 14:21-32; 14:13); they prescribe the procedures to follow when "leprosy" is suspected (Heb. *ṣāra'aṯ* denotes a wide variety of skin diseases, from which recovery was usually expected). Lev. 13:2-46 deals with various types of leprosy in humans. When certain symptoms appear, the person affected comes before the priest, who examines the disease (vv. 3,30,32,34) or the person (vv. 13,20,39). Depending on the diagnosis ("the priest shall make an examination," vv. 8,10,21,26,31), the priest may make his decision immediately or defer it until another examination seven days later (vv. 3,6,17,27,36,43). The medical diagnosis is only preliminary to the cultic ruling. The priest does not function as a physician but solely as a cultic official.

Analogous regulations govern leprosy in clothing (vv. 47-59). Clothing affected by mildew, mold, or fungus is shown to the priest (v. 49). After seven days the priest examines it again (vv. 51,56) and his decision determines how it is treated. Leprosy affecting houses is discussed in 14:33-57. The owner of a house must report any suspicious area ("there seems to be something like leprosy"). The priest orders the house to be emptied before his inspection (v. 36). After a second inspection seven days later, he decides how to proceed (v. 39). If the disease has spread, the priest makes this determination (v. 44) and declares the house unclean. If he observes that the disease has not spread (v. 48), he pronounces the house clean and performs the ritual of purification.

(2) Human encounter with the holy is dangerous and demands special caution. The holy may be present in a cultic object, which represents divinity or a deity. The ark (later understood as representing Yahweh) is such a cultic object; its power can be perceived immediately. When the ark returns from the Philistines, the people of Beth-shemesh are overjoyed to see it and offer a burnt offering (1 S. 6:13-14). But when a few violate its taboo space, they perish on the spot (6:19: "because they looked upon the ark of Yahweh"; cf. 2 S. 6:6-7). Hence the precautionary measures in Nu. 4:20; see also Josh. 3:3 (Dtr/P): the people see the ark and recognize it as a sign of Yahweh's presence in their midst, but follow it at a respectful distance.

f. *Conjuration and Divination.* The verb *rā'â* has a solid place in magical practice as a term for powerfully effective examination. For a curse to be effective, the eyes must be focused on the person or object to be cursed, either directly or, if that is impossible, in the form of a representational substitute. Notions of the "evil eye" play a role here (cf. 2 K. 2:24). Balak brings Balaam to vistas where the latter can see Israel better or "entirely" and thus be able to pronounce his curse effectually (Nu. 22:41; 23:3; cf. 24:20,21). The medium at Endor sees the spirit of dead Samuel rise up (1 S. 28:12-13). Hepatoscopy is mentioned in Ezk. 21:26(21).

5. *Theological Usage.* Theological usage should not be understood as belonging to a different realm, separate from profane usage, but as reflecting a portion of a total reality. Here *rā'â* denotes the entire spectrum of situations in which human beings experience or encounter God in their personal vision. In this sense *rā'â* is complementary to → גלה *gālâ,* "reveal": God emerges from the concealment of divinity, being revealed in and through every possible form of human experience. Thus *rā'â* denotes the act of revelation itself, God's self-manifestation in person and in action. In this usage *rā'â* is not a specifically theological term but remains epistemological. The theological element is the concern that dominates its use in describing the relationship between God and humanity: to express the epistemological character of this relationship. Therefore the use of *rā'â* in this context is not limited to a particular form of the verb (such as the niphal) or to specific groups of texts (such as cultic etiologies).[48] The various forms of the word merely accentuate different perspectives on the single revelatory event.

a. *Seeing God or God's Face.* (1) The earlier narrative traditions in particular speak quite naively of seeing God, God's face, or God's messenger. This manner of expression embodies the ancient Near Eastern understanding of how the divine is manifested. Aside from all mythological encoding, however, it emphasizes the reality of the encounter and the fact of vision as the authentication of an experience. Reflecting everyday usage, the expression "see (the face of) God/Yahweh" denotes an encounter with God that emphasizes the immediacy and personal character of the encounter.

Ex. 24:9-11 is a fragment interpolated into the Sinai theophany; its final recension interprets it as referring to Israel. Here seventy "chiefs" of Israel — not further identified — see the God of Israel (v. 10), who does not lay hands on them (v. 11); i.e., this encounter with God establishes a special relationship of trust and protection. In Gen. 16:13 (in its presumably original version, with the vocalization *rōʾī* instead of *rᵒʾī*), Hagar says: "You are 'the God who sees [= delivers] me,' for she said, 'Here I truly have seen [= encountered] God, who sees [= delivers] me.'" In her encounter with God, Hagar experiences deliverance and calls God her personal protector.

In Gen. 32:31(30) a later tradent, whose concern was the etiology of the name Penuel, has Jacob cry out after his victorious struggle during the night: "I have seen the face of God, and yet my life is preserved." Jacob responds with rhetorical hyperbole to his unexpectedly gracious treatment by Esau: "I have seen your face as one sees the face of God" (33:10). In connection with the etymology of the name Mahanaim, E speaks of Jacob's encounter with messengers of God: "When Jacob saw them, he said, 'This is God's camp'" (32:3[2]).

Near Jericho, Joshua sees "a man standing before him with a drawn sword in his hand," who identifies himself as "commander of the army of Yahweh" (Josh. 5:13). Gideon cries out with astonishment when he encounters the messenger of Yahweh: "Woe is me, I have seen the messenger of Yahweh face to face" (Jgs. 6:22; cf. Isa. 6:5). David sees the messenger of Yahweh standing between earth and heaven (1 Ch. 21:16; cf. 2 S. 24:17). A cultic theophany probably lies behind Manoah's statement that he

48. Rendtorff, 23-25.

and his wife have seen God. In 2 Ch. 26:5 "vision of God" should probably be emended to "fear of God"; otherwise the passage would express the impossible notion that vision of God could be the result of human instructions.

(2) As in extrabiblical usage, "see the face of Yahweh" becomes a technical term for "visit the temple" or "enter the sanctuary." Worshipers visit the terrestrial dwelling place of the deity to present their petitions before the image of the deity and to pray for assistance. In the Jerusalem temple, where there were no images, Israelites experience God's presence and communion with God (Ps. 42:3[2]; cf. 84:8[7]). Ex. 23:17 (cf. 34:23; Dt. 16:16) requires every Israelite to visit the temple in Jerusalem on the three pilgrimage festivals. Ex. 23:15 (cf. 34:20, now out of place) and Dt. 16:16 forbid entering the sanctuary empty-handed. Ps. 84:8(7) reflects the joy the pilgrims experience when they encounter Yahweh in his sanctuary. Dt. 31:11 ordains the reading of Yahweh's *tôrâ* when Israel assembles before him. If, however, the conduct of life is at odds with the sacrificial cult, it is meaningless and useless to see Yahweh's face (Isa. 1:12). The formula is used figuratively in 1 S. 1:22: Samuel is to remain in the temple forever and serve Yahweh. The Masoretes and before them the Jewish tradition attested in the LXX[49] found the archaic cultic idiom offensive and changed the verb from qal to niphal, "appear before Yahweh," to reflect their later notion of a deity who remains aloof from the world.

(3) In certain Psalms and in Job, the notion of seeing God face to face represents a personal encounter with God that alleviates the worshiper's affliction. In Ps. 42/43 the psalmist in an unclean land prays for Yahweh's presence: "When shall I come and behold the face of Yahweh?" (42:3[2]). Remembering his mortal affliction, the author of the thanksgiving hymn Isa. 38:9-20 recalls his lament: "I said, I shall not see Yahweh again in the land of the living" (v. 11). Job 33:26 generalizes on the individual experience of alleviated affliction, elevating it to a principle of sapiential theology: "If he prays to God, God accepts him, and he comes to see God's face with joy." In the depths of affliction, left to himself and God, the poet finds assurance: "My eyes will see him, no longer a stranger" (19:27); this assurance is realized in 42:5: "Now my eye has seen you." Personal encounter with God establishes intimate communion. The afflicted worshiper now is a friend of God and can hope for God's help.

(4) The message of eschatological deliverance draws on the notion of seeing God, with certain changes. People will see their maker, and their eyes will look upon the Holy One of Israel (Isa. 17:7). According to Isa. 33:17, the redeemed will see with their eyes the king in his beauty. In the age of salvation, the people in Zion will see their "Teacher" — i.e., immediate personal contact with Yahweh will be possible, because he will no longer be hidden (30:20; but 1QIs[a] and LXX read the plural, so that the promise refers to the teachers of Israel).

(5) As the theologically motivated emendations of Jewish tradents have already suggested,[50] these circles took offense at the notion of seeing God apart from visions and

49. See IV.2 below.
50. See III.5.a.(2) above.

theophanies. Drawing on ancient taboo motifs (put in the form of words spoken by Yahweh), they emphasize the impossibility of such seeing: "You cannot see my face; no one can see me and live" (Ex. 33:20,22; cf. 19:21; Dt. 4:12,15; 18:16).

b. *Experiencing God's Power.* Much more common than the immediate sight of God is the experience of divine presence in God's *kāḇôḏ* and acts in history. These two aspects are not always entirely distinct.

(1) In Ex. 16:6-7 (P^G) Moses says: "This evening you shall know that it was Yahweh who brought you out of the land of Egypt, and tomorrow you shall see the glory of Yahweh." What the Israelites see is not just the cloud that accompanies them as a sign of God's presence, but their safe passage under God's guidance (cf. Nu. 14:22). Above all, Yahweh's glory may be seen in his sanctuary (Ps. 63:3[2]). Seeing it, the assembled congregation prostrate themselves in worshipful adoration (Ex. 33:10; Lev. 9:24); nature is gripped by turmoil: the earth trembles (Ps. 97:4), the mountains writhe (Hab. 3:10), the sea flees (Ps. 104:7), the waters tremble (77:17[16]). But it is not in these cosmic manifestations that Yahweh's glory is seen: according to 97:6, it is the righteousness of Yahweh proclaimed by the heavens that all the peoples behold. The proof of his righteousness is the restoration and ingathering of his people. It is in the return of Yahweh's people to Jerusalem that Yahweh's glory is visible to all people. The eschatological gathering of the people who "have not seen my glory" (Isa. 66:19) is intended to demonstrate Yahweh's sovereignty over the gods of the peoples, or more precisely to demonstrate his uniqueness. It instigates the peoples to come and experience for themselves Yahweh's glory (66:18; cf. 35:2). Contrariwise, it is the misery of the wicked not to see the "majesty" of Yahweh — i.e., they will not participate in his eschatological glory (26:10).

(2) Yahweh's presence can be seen in his actions. Again and again, Israel is reminded of Yahweh's present and past acts of deliverance, to reinforce their trust in Yahweh: "See the deliverance that Yahweh will accomplish for you today" (Ex. 14:13; cf. 16:32; 6:1; 14:31; 34:10; Josh. 23:3; 24:7; Jgs. 2:7; 2 Ch. 20:17; Ps. 66:5). Powerful signs evoke understanding in a wavering people, so that they confess: "Yahweh indeed is God" (1 K. 18:39; cf. 1 S. 12:16,24). Otherwise they will meet with God's judgment, which their ancestors experienced (Ps. 95:11; 2 Ch. 29:8; 30:7).

The prophets also speak to Israel in the present: "Lift up your eyes, O Jerusalem, and see those who come from the north" (Jer. 13:20; cf. 4:21; 7:21). "All flesh shall see that I, Yahweh, have kindled the fire" (Ezk. 21:4[20:48], with *rā'â* replacing *yāḏa'* in the recognition formula; cf. 39:21). Finally, Israel itself experiences divine judgment directly (Jer. 44:2; cf. Ps. 74:9; 88:15; Lam. 3:1).

The peoples, too, will experience Yahweh's judgment, and must therefore acknowledge Yahweh as their Lord (Ezk. 39:21; cf. 28:18; Isa. 14:16; Ps. 48:6[5]; Zec. 9:5; extended to the last judgment: Isa. 18:3). With total sovereignty Yahweh makes other peoples and their rulers his instruments of judgment (Hab. 1:5; Isa. 41:2-5).

In Mic. 7:8-10, a late exilic hymn of trust, the congregation of Israel hopes to see Yahweh's vindication (v. 9), which will put their enemies to shame (v. 10). Anticipating this event, Deutero-Isaiah calls on those listening: "Lift up your eyes all around and see" (Isa. 49:18; cf. 60:4). The remnant of Israel will see Yahweh's deliverance

with their own eyes (Mal. 1:5) and rejoice (Zec. 10:7). The gathering of the remnant becomes a new creation: "Then all will see and know, all will consider and understand, that the hand of Yahweh has done all this" (Isa. 41:20). When Yahweh returns to Zion, his vindication of his people is manifested to the eyes of all peoples (52:8,10; cf. Ps. 98:7).

The wretched conditions in postexilic Jerusalem lead Trito-Isaiah to prophesy a new intervention on the part of Yahweh, which Israel and the peoples will see and experience (Isa. 60:4; 61:9; 62:2; 64:3[4]; cf. Mic. 7:16; Isa. 29:3). Isa. 33:20 uses the image of an untroubled Jerusalem to describe the coming time of salvation: "Your eyes will see Jerusalem, a quiet habitation, an immovable tent"; an early apocalyptic poem (66:6-16) interprets it as Yahweh's universal and final intervention to defeat the nations, which Israel will see with rejoicing (v. 14; cf. Ps. 48:9[8]).

Like the people of Israel and the nations, individuals can experience the effects of Yahweh's presence in their own lives. Yahweh's work of creation makes them experience their own dependency (Ps. 8:4[3]; cf. 107:24). The psalmist experiences Yahweh's goodness and living presence corporeally (34:9[8]). Everyone who fears Yahweh will see lifelong "the prosperity of Jerusalem/of your chosen ones" (128:5; 106:5; cf. 27:13). To their shame, the wicked will see Yahweh's intervention on behalf of the afflicted (86:17; 112:10; cf. 37:34; 91:8; Job 34:26; Isa. 52:15). Those Yahweh has delivered will look down on their enemies (Ps. 54:9[7]; 112:8; 118:7); all who have experienced Yahweh's deliverance are filled with joy (69:33[32]; 107:42) and holy fear (40:4[3]; 52:8[6], playing on *rā'â/yārē'*; cf. Isa. 49:7).

c. *Analyzing One's Own Conduct.* Both the experience of Yahweh's presence in seeing God represented in the cult and the apprehension of Yahweh's mighty acts in history require open and comprehending eyes. Therefore they also call the subject's attention to his or her own actions and conduct, in order to realize in the act of *rā'â* the personal relationship and intimate communion that exists between Yahweh and Israel.

(1) Occasionally the community or an individual recognizes a sinful act as such and redresses it (Dt. 9:16; 29:16[17]; Jgs. 19:30; 1 S. 14:38; 2 K. 23:24; Neh. 13:15; cf. Ps. 55:10[9]; 119:158). The sign that Yahweh performs before the eyes of Israel is to make the people know and see their wickedness (1 S. 12:17). According to Hos. 5:13, Ephraim and Judah can no longer ignore their "sickness," but they turn to foreign powers for help instead of to Yahweh. Using the metaphor of two sisters, the historical allegory in Ezk. 23 exposes the sinfulness of all Israel. Although the younger has the example of her older sister before her eyes, she refuses to see it and acts all the more sinfully (v. 11). Finally Israel's transgressions are exposed, its sins and outrages brought to light (v. 29). According to Ezk. 14:22, the survivors of the catastrophe will be a band of sinners and transgressors, walking witnesses to Yahweh's righteousness, in whom the exiles can see their own guilt. According to Ezk. 18, understanding enables both the individual and the nation to avert catastrophe: "Because they considered and turned away from all the transgressions they had committed, they shall surely live" (v. 28). Hence the prophets' urgent appeal that the people not shut their eyes to sinful reality (Jer. 2:23; 3:2; cf. Am. 6:2; Jer. 2:10; 5:1). Am. 3:9 calls on Assyria and Egypt to testify in Yahweh's action against Samaria, bearing witness to its misdeeds.

(2) Israel has foreclosed the possibility of insight. It is "a rebellious house, who have eyes to see but do not see" (Ezk. 12:2; cf. Jer. 5:21; Isa. 42:18; also Isa. 5:12; 22:11; 42:20). Instead they scoff at Yahweh: "Let him make haste, let him speed his work, that we may see it" (Isa. 5:19). Israel prefers to trust in idols made by human hands, which have eyes but do not see, ears but do not hear (Ps. 115:5-6; 135:16-17; cf. Dt. 4:28; Isa. 44:18; 41:23). In Jer. 2:31 the prophet's purpose is to open the eyes of this blind people, that they may finally see the "word of God" at work in history (cf. Ezk. 12:3, with reference to the symbolic action to follow; Isa. 42:18, with reference to the prophet's message). Israel's continued unwillingness to see and hear leads finally to Yahweh's judgment, which makes them incapable of seeing and hearing (Isa. 6:9-10). The true ability to see and hear will come only in the eschatological age of salvation, brought about by Yahweh (32:3; cf. 17:8; 29:18; 33:15).

d. *God as Subject.* All human apperception of God requires God's prior self-revelation in his personal identity and the communication of God's name. It is Yahweh who opens human eyes so that they may comprehend reality truly (Gen. 21:19; 2 K. 6:17,20; cf. Prov. 20:12), who causes humans to see, who appears, who oversees the work of creation. These anthropomorphic expressions derive from the language of myth (Gen. 2:19; 11:5; cf. 6:3), but "their intention is not in the least to reduce God to a rank similar to that of man. . . . [Their purpose] is to make God accessible to man. . . . They represent God as a person. . . . He has a will, He exists in controversy ready to communicate Himself, offended at men's sins yet with a ready ear for their supplication and compassion for their confessions of guilt."[51]

(1) The goodness (= suitability, meaningfulness) of God's work of creation is grounded in God's seeing it (Gen. 1:4,10,12,18,21,25, and the final verdict in v. 31). P thus shortens the verdict of the Creator to the object for which God is praised. Enthroned on high, God surveys all creation to its depths (Ps. 113:6), to the ends of the earth (Job 28:24; cf. 28:27), knows every mortal from the moment of conception (Ps. 139:16; cf. 1 S. 16:7; Job 10:4), regards the lowly; no one can hide so as not to be seen by God (Jer. 23:24). When God sees the suffering and affliction of an individual or the people, the act of apperception evokes God's personal compassion and succor; the affliction is already relieved. Such relief of affliction experienced by an individual can be the subject of a narrative recounted in connection with the naming of a place (Gen. 16:13-14), the birth of a child (29:32, JE), or a divine determination (31:42). It is a constant motif in supplications and laments (1 S. 1:11; 2 S. 16:12; Ps. 10:14; 25:18,19; 59:5[4]; 119:153), in praise and thanksgiving (Ps. 9:14[13]; 31:8[7]), and in divine promises (Gen. 31:12; 2 K. 20:5 = Isa. 38:5). The tortuous history of Israel's deliverance begins with Yahweh's assurance: "I have seen the misery of my people in Egypt" (Ex. 3:7,9). This assurance is recalled in the face of current affliction (Ex. 2:25 [P]; 4:31 [Dtr?]; Dt. 26:7; 2 K. 13:4; 14:26). It is renewed in fresh situations of need (1 S. 9:16; cf. Ezk. 16:6) and promised for the future (Zec. 9:8); as narrative or description, it becomes a fixed motif in communal laments and supplications (Lam. 1:9,11,20;

51. L. Köhler, *OT Theology* (Eng. trans. Philadelphia, 1957), 24-25.

3:36,50,60; 5:1; Neh. 9:9; Dnl. 9:18) as well as thanksgivings (Ps. 106:44; Lam. 3:59); finally it expands to a prayer for God's eschatological appearance (Isa. 63:15; cf. Ps. 80:15[14]).

As in secular usage, God's seeing can have connotations of searching, testing, and judging. The Lord of the universe, enthroned on high, looks upon all humankind (Ps. 33:13; cf. 14:2 = 53:3[2]), examining all human ways and steps (Job 31:4; 34:21), seeing to the heart of the individual (Jer. 12:3), probing the heart and the mind (Jer. 20:12), observing the corruption of the earth (Gen. 6:12) and the stubbornness of his people (Ex. 32:9; Dt. 9:13), but also the repentance of the people of Nineveh (Jon. 3:10; cf. 2 Ch. 12:7). Persecuted unjustly in court by personal enemies, the devout psalmist implores Yahweh to consider his manner of life. Affirmation of love for Yahweh's *tôrâ* is grounds for confidence in Yahweh's vindicating intervention (Ps. 119:159; 139:24).

God's searching vision discerns what human individual is suited to an assignment. From among the sons of Jesse, God "sees" (= chooses) David as king (1 S. 15:1; cf. 2 K. 8:13). Personal merit plays no role here, only the person's suitability in God's eyes for carrying out God's plan. It is in this sense, for J, that God sees Noah as the "right(eous)" one for the project of preserving God's creatures (Gen. 7:1, in contrast to P). In Gen. 22:14 the name *yhwh yr'h* is a response to Abraham's lament in v. 8: "God will pick out the lamb for a burnt offering." It is an expression of praise and thanks to God, voicing a joy set free from distress and despair. Ezk. 16:8 and Hos. 9:10 speak metaphorically of God's election of Israel, although Rudolph erroneously disputes this interpretation of Hos. 9:10.[52]

The linguistic and conceptual realm of the courtroom are the source of the notion that God sees injustice, oppression, and idolatry. This "seeing" means God's intervention as judge, with judicial examination preceding execution of the judgment. The wicked think that "the Lord does not see" (Ps. 94:7; cf. 10:11; Job 22:14; Jer. 12:4), and the people who have turned away from Yahweh ask defiantly, "Why do we fast, but you do not see?" (Isa. 58:3) or groundlessly feel forsaken by Yahweh (Ezk. 8:12; 9:9). Yahweh can only laugh at such behavior, for he knows that the day (of judgment) is coming (Ps. 37:13). The epiphany of Yahweh as judge has cosmic consequences: the earth shakes and the nations tremble at his gaze (Hab. 3:6).

First Yahweh conducts a careful inquiry to determine the transgression(s) of an individual, a group, or the entire people. God sees the blood of Naboth (2 K. 9:26), horrible things at Bethel (Hos. 6:10), Ephraim leading out his children to slaughter (Hos. 9:13; text uncertain), disgusting things among Samaria's prophets (Jer. 23:13-14), Israel's impurity (Ezk. 23:13), its abominations on the hills and in the fields (Jer. 13:27), the defamation of its sons and daughters (Dt. 32:19), "that there is no justice" and that there is no one to intervene (Isa. 59:15-16). God's watchful gaze seals the fate of the desecrated sanctuary (Jer. 7:11) and confirms the sin of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen. 18:21).

---

52. Rudolph, *Hosea. KAT* XIII/1 (1966), 185.

God's discouraging observation in Gen. 6:5 (J) that groups or generations of human beings are capable of transgressions that threaten the very existence of humankind motivates God's decision to destroy all human and animal life; but it is also and above all a source of profound sorrow (v. 6). The notion of a vengeful God seeking blind justice is foreign to the OT. God, too, suffers in divine judgment (cf. the use of *rā'â* in the late text 1 Ch. 21:15). The theologoumenon "God knows those who are worthless, he sees the wicked even if he takes no note" (Job 11:11), which has become a sapiential maxim, encourages someone entangled in an unjust legal action to ask God's intervention as both witness and judge (1 S. 24:16[15]; 2 K. 19:16 = Isa. 37:17; 1 Ch. 12:18[17]; 2 Ch. 24:22; Hab. 1:13; Ps. 35:17,22).

(2) Various texts speak of God as causing someone to see or showing something. God grants Jacob a long life so that he may not only see Joseph once more but also Joseph's children (Gen. 48:11). Yahweh shows Pharaoh what he is about to do (Gen. 41:28), helps Jeremiah see through the intrigues of his enemies (Jer. 11:18), makes the psalmist "see many troubles and calamities" (Ps. 71:20). According to the theory of P, Yahweh himself revealed the pattern of the sanctuary and its contents (Ex. 25:9; 27:8; cf. Nu. 8:4 with regard to the altar).

In the promise recorded in Gen. 12:1 (J), the emphasis is on the assurance of God's guidance on Abram's journey from his homeland to the promised land (cf. Dt. 1:33). "Not let see the land" means denial of entrance and possession (Josh. 5:6 for the desert generation; cf. Dt. 34:4 for Moses). Dt. 4:5 associates guidance with God's statutes and ordinances. Yahweh shows his presence in his *kāḇôḏ* (Jgs. 13:22 — not without some peril) and his mighty acts in history. According to Ex. 9:16, Yahweh lets Pharaoh live in order to show him his power. He shows himself near to his people in the sign of his great fire (Dt. 4:36), in his power (3:24; 5:24), and in his mighty arm (3:24). To the faithful he promises to show his salvation (Ps. 50:23; 91:16), i.e., an abundance of blessings comprehending the whole world of reality.

With the words "Show us your steadfast love, O Lord" (Ps. 85:8[7]), the exilic community prays for Yahweh's intervention in history as prophesied by Deutero-Isaiah. The early postexilic prayer in Mic. 7:15 conjures up the exodus. Like Egypt in days gone by, the nations with their superior force are to experience the might of Yahweh, so that "they shall lay their hands on their mouths and their ears go deaf (v. 16; on the gesture cf. Prov. 30:32). The petition in Ps. 90:16 probably reflects the same time and situation. The psalmist looks forward to deliverance through an oracle of salvation that makes manifest God's merciful purpose, thus revealing God's glory in the present generation and for generations to come. According to 59:11(10), God's epiphany in the presence of the congregation also brings about a personal encounter with God, so that the psalmist experiences God's steadfast love in God's judgment on the enemy.

Ps. 78 is a didactic composition in the style of Levitical parenesis. Recalling Israel's ancestors, it warns the present generation not to forget the miracles of Yahweh "that he showed them" (v. 11), cautioning them not to exhibit their ancestors' stiff-necked refusal to acknowledge his sovereignty and obey his laws. Contempt for the message of salvation addressed to those who heed Yahweh's word speaks from the quotation in Isa. 66:5: "Let Yahweh show his glory, that we may see your joy." These words corre-

spond precisely to the response of Isaiah's enemies to his prophecy of judgment (5:19). On his day of judgment, therefore, Yahweh will not turn his face toward the people and all his enemies among them in blessing and deliverance, but will show them his back, so that the day of judgment will be the day of their calamity (Jer. 18:17).

(3) Various contexts use the niphal of *rā'â* with a divine subject (God, Yahweh, Yahweh's messenger, the glory of Yahweh) to describe a theophany. This expression was probably used at an early date for the appearance of God at a spot made sacred by this appearance (Gen. 12:7; 18:1; 22:14; 35:1; Ex. 3:2,16; 4:1,5; cf. Gen. 17:1; 26:2,24; 35:9; 48:3; 1 S. 3:21 [where the statement in v. 21a is restricted by v. 21b: "Yahweh revealed himself to Samuel by his word"]). The usage reflected in these passages is already highly developed. Even in J we may detect a semantic shift of *rā'â* from the visual-sensory realm to that of personal encounter, and hence a change in emphasis from a description of a theophany to the purpose behind God's appearance: statement of a promise (Gen. 12:6-7; 26:24-25; Ex. 3:2-3, JE).

In P the visible event is totally insignificant. Even the aspect of personal encounter plays only a minor role. The expression has become a formulaic introduction to divine speech, serving solely to emphasize the transcendence of the speaker (Gen. 17:1ff.; 35:9ff.; 48:3ff.). This usage fits with the manner in which P's material is usually presented, for which rhetorical dress is the dominant stylistic device. The essential substance is put into speeches. Revelation takes place in the word. These fundamental reservations concerning the visual aspects of the encounter with God are documented by the pointed contrast between *rā'â* and *yāḏa'* in Ex. 6:3. Moses marks the beginning of a new era: Yahweh makes himself known in his name; his appearance is assigned to a preliminary stage. Ex. 6:2-7 looks forward to P's account of the exodus event, which becomes the factor establishing knowledge of God as Yahweh (7:5; 14:4,18; 16:6-7,12), later realized in the divine presence in the sanctuary (29:45-46) and the annual observance of the Festival of Booths (Lev. 23:43).

The later development of the traditions reflecting cultic theophanies in Jerusalem (Isa. 6; Ps. 97; cf. 2 S. 22:11,16 = Ps. 18:11,16[10,15]; 2 Ch. 7:3) uses language concerning the appearance of Yahweh's glory to announce Yahweh's demonstration of power when the people are disobedient (Ex. 16:10; Nu. 14:10; 16:19; 17:7; 20:6). The cultic practice of the second temple is presupposed in Lev. 9:1-24 (the sin offerings of the high priest) and 16:1-34 (the ritual of the Day of Atonement). Both texts reflect the ancient conviction that the appearance of Yahweh's glory (9:4,6,23; 16:2) requires special provisions. The function of the cloud of incense as a protective veil surrounding the theophanic deity (16:2) is a very late theological notion.

Divorced from its original settings, mention of the appearance of Yahweh or his messenger (Jgs. 6:12; 13:3,10,21) is a stylistic device used to introduce a narrative culminating in a promise uttered by the deity. Examples include the prediction of the birth of a child: Gen. 18:1ff.; Jgs. 13:3ff.; a promise of descendants: Gen. 26:2ff.; an assurance of deliverance: Jgs. 6:12ff.; and a dynastic oracle: 1 K. 3:5ff.; 9:2ff. (both Dtr and stylized as dreams; presented differently in 2 Ch. 1:7; 7:12; cf. 1 K. 11:9). Later usage relates the expression to God's appearance at Sinai (Ex. 20:18; cf. v. 22) and at the tent of meeting (Nu. 14:14; Dt. 31:15).

Exilic and postexilic prophecy draws on the old language of theophany to promise Yahweh's new salvation in the immediate or distant future. According to Jer. 31:3, just as Yahweh appeared to Moses in the past, so he will appear to the people in exile, who seem to have dwelt so long apart from his presence, to lead them out of captivity into freedom, just as he led the people out of Egypt. Borrowing the message of Deutero-Isaiah, Ps. 102:17(16) describes the appearance and return of Yahweh's glory to Zion. For its prophecy of salvation, Isa. 60:2 strikingly alters the motif of Yahweh's epiphany. The notions of Yahweh's coming and Yahweh's epiphany coalesce. At the same time, Yahweh's appearance is transformed into an astral or solar metaphor. Yahweh appears like the rising sun, which suffuses everything with new life. To the Israelites deported to Egypt under Ptolemy I in 312, Zec. 9:14 proclaims God's salvific intervention in the image of a great theophany in which God judges the earth. Mal. 3:2 moderates the people's yearning for Yahweh to appear at once, since his day is a day of judgment.

e. *Visions.* Prophetic texts use *rā'â* for visionary experiences, often parallel with → חזה *ḥāzâ.* In most cases this parallelism does not suggest synonymy (as in, e.g., Isa. 30:10) but signals a significant semantic distinction, which should always be observed.[53] While *ḥāzâ* is a technical term originally denoting a specific form of revelation, which appears to have been associated with the preprophetic seers (Nu. 24:4,16; cf. Isa. 1:1; Am. 1:1; Mic. 1:1)[54] and later came to be used as a general term for receiving a revelation (Isa. 13:1; 29:10; Ezk. 12:27),[55] *rā'â* belongs to the language of vision accounts.[56] There have been other attempts to define the difference.[57]

(1) In seer utterances (a genre whose existence has been amply demonstrated[58]), the seer uses *rā'â* in the first person as a formulaic introduction to the description of the vision: "I see him, but not now; I behold *(šûr)* him, but not near: a star shall come out of Jacob" (Nu. 24:17; cf. 1 K. 22:17). The seer transforms what he has seen in his visionary experience into a speech event (Nu. 23:9; cf. v. 21, where a first person sg. has apparently been transformed into a third person sg. in the course of transmission). The seer's self-awareness and responsibility for giving his vision verbal form find expression in the legitimation formula with which a seer's utterance begins: *n^{e}'um* followed by the name of the seer (Balaam in Nu. 24:4,16; the other instances of the formula are archaizing: 2 S. 23:1; Prov. 30:1; Ps. 36:2[1] [text?]).

That God is behind the vision expressed in verbal form is beyond question: "Whatever he [Yahweh] shows me I will tell you" (Nu. 23:3). Yahweh first opens the eyes of the seer (Nu. 22:31; cf. 2 K. 6:17,20) so that he can understand God's plan (Nu. 24:1). The danger that a seer's eyes might be constrained to prevent his seeing the vision sent by God is caricatured in Nu. 22:22-35, a late passage ridiculing Balaam.

---

53. Contra H. J. Stoebe, *VT* 29 (1989) 347.

54. See Fuhs, *Sehen,* 32.

55. See H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1991), 5-6; H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1977), 120.

56. Vetter, *THAT,* II, 697; cf. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 27.

57. Hänel, 7-13; Häusermann, 4-8; Jepsen, 43-56; Johnson, 11-26.

58. Vetter, *Seherspruch;* Fuhs, *Sehen.*

(2) The ancient seer tradition survives well into the period of so-called classical prophecy. Amos, Isaiah, and Micah thought of themselves as seers. In Am. 1:1*; 9:1*; and Mic. 1:1-6*, remnants of seer utterances have been preserved. In Isa. 30:10 the prophet associates himself with the seers and mantics. In any case the rhetorical forms of the seer utterance have been adopted by and incorporated into the prophetic speech forms of the later period. The legitimation formula *nᵉ'um* + PN is transformed into the formula identifying an oracle of Yahweh *(nᵉ'um yhwh)* or into *dᵉḇar* or *diḇrê* + PN.

The function of *rā'â* remains unchanged throughout. There are vision accounts in the third person: Gen. 18:2; 19:1; Ex. 3:2; 2 K. 2:10,12,15; 6:17,20 (all late). Much more common are first-person accounts by the prophets of their visionary experiences. They begin with an introductory formula using *rā'â* and (usually) *wᵉhinnēh.* Two forms are found: *rā'â* qal in the first person singular perfective (1 K. 22:17,19; Jer. 4:23; Ezk. 37:8; Am. 9:1; Zec. 1:8) or the consecutive imperfective (Isa. 6:1; Ezk. 1:4,15; 2:9; 8:2,7,10; 10:1; 44:4; Zec. 2:1,5[1:18; 2:1]; 5:1; 6:1), echoing the seer utterance, emphasizes the "I" of the person who sees; *rā'â* hiphil emphasizes the divine originator of the vision (Am. 7:1,4,7; 8:1; cf. 2 K. 8:10,13; Jer. 24:1; 38:21; Ezk. 11:25; 40:4; Zec. 1:9; 2:3[1:20]; 3:1 [subj.: an angel]).

From Amos to Zechariah, in the first-person accounts of visions we observe a formal schema that clearly remained unchanged for centuries. The opening formula is followed by a dialogue between Yahweh and the prophet reflecting a stereotyped question-answer-interpretation schema. An example is Jer. 1:11-12: "'Jeremiah, what do you see?' I answered: 'I see a branch of an almond tree.' Then Yahweh said to me, 'You have seen well, for I am watching over my word to perform it'" (cf. 1:13-14; 24:1ff.; Am. 7:7-9; 8:1-3; Zec. 4:2-6; 5:2-3).[59] The confirmation formula "Son of man, do you see?" or "Have you seen, son of man?" spoken by God in Ezk. 8:6,12,15,17 (cf. 47:6; Jer. 3:6; 7:17; 33:24) is probably borrowed from forensic usage.[60] The same context is suggested by the divine imperative addressed to the prophet: "See the vile abominations that they are committing here" (Ezk. 8:9; cf. 44:5).

Theophanic elements enter into the description of the prophet's call. The sense of a divine encounter in which God calls and commissions the prophet is an experience that the prophet can describe verbally only by drawing on the familiar symbols associated with cultic theophanies (Isa. 6; cf. 1 K. 22:19; Ezk. 1:4-28 + 3:12-15; cf. 10:1,8-17). By contrast, Ezk. 33:1-9 (cf. Hab. 2:1ff.; Isa. 21:6-7) uses the image of the sentinel to describe the mission of the prophet.

The concentrated use of *rā'â* in Ezekiel is striking. The formula introducing the call vision in 1:1 is repeated in v. 15, linking the two sections. In vv. 1,15,27,28 (cf. 10:1,8,9), *rā'â* draws special attention to what the prophet sees. Cross-references link the visions "that I had seen by the river Chebar" (3:23; 8:4; 10:15,20,22; cf. 11:24; 43:3 [3 times]).

All in all, visionary experience once again plays a central role in late prophecy (see

59. On visions involving word symbols and word assonance, see F. Horst, *EvT* 20 (1960) 193-205.

60. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1,* associates it with what he calls a "demonstration"; for a different view see G. Fohrer, *Studien zur alttestamentlichen Prophetie (1949-1965). BZAW* 99 (1967), 19.

Zec. 1:8; 2:1,5[1:18; 2:1]; 4:2; 5:1,2,5,9; 6:1,8). The argument as to whether these night visions involve waking visions or dreams can probably be decided on the basis of 4:1, which describes the transition from one vision to another in terms of being awakened. Emulations of vision narratives in the context of nascent apocalypticism are found in Dnl. 8:2,3,4,6,7,15,20; 9:21; 10:5,7,8; 12:5. Thanks to the influence of visionary style, *rā'â* qal found its way occasionally into dream narratives, whose linguistic form is clearly distinct from that of vision accounts (cf. Gen. 41:22; 31:10,12).

According to Joel 3:1(2:28), Moses' desire expressed in Nu. 11:29 (J?) will be realized at the beginning of the eschatological age of salvation, albeit extended to all humanity. God's spirit will make all people prophets. This promise can hardly refer to a commission to prophesy; it suggests direct access to God through dreams and visions. This immediacy of God fundamentally abrogates all differences among human beings.

6. *Nouns.*

a. *rō'eh.* According to 1 S. 9:9, *rō'eh* (I) was the earlier title of a *nāḇî'.* This expression is hardly an "antiquarian detail";[61] we have here a late (possibly vernacular) term for "seer." In 1 Ch. 9:22; 26:28; 29:29, it is used as an epithet for Samuel, in 2 Ch. 16:7,10 for an otherwise unknown seer Hanani. The ancient term for "seer" was probably *ḥōzeh.* In any case both expressions refer to the same charism, which was not possessed *eo ipso* by every *nāḇî.* It sets Amos apart from Isaiah, for example: Isa. 30:10, using two terms (in the pl.) parallel, forbids the latter to function as a visionary (cf. Am. 7:12,14).[62] Stoebe's theory that Amaziah called Amos a seer "to denigrate his significance, coming as he did from a rural area, where he received whatever commission he had,"[63] is highly dubious.[64]

The noun *rō'eh* II, "vision," appears in Isa. 28:7. In this treatment of a bitter invective (28:7-13), the cultic prophets are accused of being drunk when they prophesy, so that their visions demonstrate their blindness to the eschatological message.

b. *mar'â.* The noun *mar'â,* usually in the plural, denotes the occurrences of a visionary event (Nu. 12:6 par. *ḥ^{a}lôm;* in 1 S. 3:15 it refers to an auditory event). The phrase *mar'ōṯ 'elōhîm* as an expression for seeing visions of God (Ezk. 1:1; 8:3; 40:2[65]) is most likely not a formula reflecting the ancient seer tradition[66] but rather a proto-apocalyptic idiom belonging to the final redaction of the book. On "visions of the night" see Gen. 46:2. In Dnl. 10:7,8,16, the singular refers to a visionary occurrence.

c. *mar'eh.* The noun *mar'eh* appears in Ex. 3:3; 24:17; Nu. 8:4; 12:8; Ezk. 11:24; 43:3; Dnl. 8:16,26-27; 9:23; 10:1; like *mar'â,* it means "vision." In descriptions of visions it generally denotes the object seen in the vision: "something resembling . . . ,"

---

61. H. J. Stoebe, *VT* 39 (1989) 347-48; *idem, KAT* VIII/1, 202-3.

62. See Wolff, *Joel and Amos,* 312-13; Stoebe, *VT* 39 (1989) 341-54.

63. Stoebe, 351.

64. On Isa. 30:10 (cf. 28:7 and 21:8 [emended]), see Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 2002), 145-46.

65. See *BHS.*

66. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1,* 27; Vetter, *THAT,* II, 699.

"appearance" (Ezk. 1:5,13,27-28; 8:2,4; 10:1,9-10,22; 11:24; 40:3). The vagueness of the description is emphasized by the use of k^e (Ezk. 1:13,26-27,28; 8:2; 10:1; 40:3; Dnl. 8:15; 10:6,18; Joel 2:4) or the reduplication *mar'eh* k^e*mar'eh* (Ezk. 40:3; 41:21; 43:3).

In everyday usage *mar'eh* denotes the act of seeing (with one's eyes: Lev. 13:12; Dt. 28:34,67; Josh 22:10; Isa. 11:3 [outward appearance]; Ezk. 23:15-16), appearance (Gen. 39:6; 1 S. 17:42; etc.), and bearing (Cant. 2:14; 5:15).

d. *Other Nouns.* Other nominal formations include *r*^{e}*'î*, "mirror" (Job 37:18) = *mar'â* in Ex. 38:8 and *r*^{e}*'ûṯ*, "view," in Eccl. 5:10(11) *Q (K r*^{e}*'îṯ)*.

IV. 1. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* In the Dead Sea Scrolls *rā'â* (qal, niphal, and hiphil) occurs some 55 times, exclusive of OT quotations in the *p*^{e}*šārîm*.[67]

Of the nominal derivatives, there are 4 occurrences of *mar'â* (1QM 5:5,11; 1Q34 fr. 2, 2:6; 11QT 3:16[?]) and 13 of *mar'eh* (1QM 5:11; 6:13; 4Q403 fr. 1, 2:3,6,8; 4Q405 frs. 15-16, 22:3; 4Q405 frs. 20-22, 2:10 [twice]; 4Q405 fr. 23, 2:8,9; 4Q160 fr. 1, 5; 4Q160 frs. 3-4, 1:6; 11QPs^a 28:9).

In general usage *rā'â* qal/niphal appears in the following contexts:

a. *See/Become Visible.* According to 1QS 7:14, whoever takes out his "hand" from his clothes so that his nakedness can be seen is to be punished for thirty days. To avoid impurity the camp or temple precincts and the city must be kept clean so that "no indecent, wicked thing" (i.e., excrement) can be seen (1QM 7:7; cf. 11QT 46:15), a requirement based on Dt. 23:13-15(12-14) or some earlier shared tradition.

b. *Observe.* In the face of enemy superiority, 11QT 61:13 demands fearlessness: "When you go out to war against your enemies, and you see horses and chariots and a people more numerous than you, do not fear them." This exhortation is followed by an assurance of help incorporating the "brought you up" exodus formula[68] (l. 140). CD 9:16ff. requires a person who observes an offense while alone to denounce the offender (9:17,22). The point at issue here is the law of evidence. A similar situation is addressed by the propitiatory ritual for a murder by a person or persons unknown: "Our hands have not spilled this blood and our eyes have not seen anything" (11QT 63:6; cf. Dt. 21:1-9) — i.e., the speakers did not commit the crime; neither can they give evidence against the perpetrator. A person "afflicted with a visible blemish" must be denied a place in the community (1QSa 2:7). According to 11QT 64:13, anyone who sees a neighbor's ox, sheep, or ass straying must not look without taking action (cf. Dt. 22:1-2).

c. *Search Out.* The Qumran legislation governing the marriage of a woman taken as a prisoner of war (11QT 63:10ff.) is more restrictive than its parallel in Dt. 21:10-14. Someone who "singles out a beautiful woman" among the prisoners (63:11) and desires to make her his wife must remove from her all marks of captivity. A wisdom poem concerning the wiles of the wicked woman describes her as raising her eyes impudently to "spot" a just man, in order to trip him up (4Q184 1:13).

---

67. M. P. Horgan, *Pesharim. CBQMS* 8 (1979).

68. → עלה *'ālâ*.

The majority of occurrences appear in theological contexts. Two passages involve visions: 1Q25 1:3 (fragment of an apocryphal prophecy) and 6Q9 58:2. In both cases, however, the text is dubious. The visionary style is imitated in a description of the "wise in knowledge, who hear the voice of Glory and behold the holy angels" (1QM 10:10-11).

More often we read of people who experience (*rā'â* qal/niphal) God's action and favor in their lives or in historical events. Older, however, is the observation that "one sees but does not know and plans without believing in the spring of life" (1QH 8:13-14). The only remedy is for Yahweh to open one's eyes: "I have seen *(r'h)* this, . . . [how] shall I know (*nbṭ* hiphil) unless you open my eyes?" (1QH 18:18-19). The cause of this blindness is the fact that the eyes "are sealed through having seen evil" (1QH 7:2-3). There, employing the style of didactic wisdom, the Teacher of Righteousness exhorts: "Listen to me and I shall open your eyes to see and understand the works of God" (CD 2:14-15). Those who hearken to his voice will see his salvation (CD 20:33-34). Conversely, the nation of the elect will see God's judgment on the wicked (4QpPs37 4:11, reinterpreting Ps. 37:34). Finally, in a poem concerning Jerusalem (4Q380 fr. 1, 1:2-6; cf. 11QPs^{a} 22:1-15; 4QPs^{f} 7:14-17) we read: "The name of Yahweh is invoked over her, and his glory appears (*rā'â* niphal) over Jerusalem and Zion" (l. 6). Contrariwise, 4Q504 frs. 1-2, 4:8 sounds the note of salvation, including all nations in Yahweh's salvific act: "All nations will see your glory."

Other texts, complementary to these, say that Yahweh sees, causes something to be seen (shows), or appears (*rā'â* qal, hiphil, niphal, respectively). Yahweh sees the abominable conduct of humanity and the constant pollution of the land (or the earth) (4Q381 fr. 69, 1); it is unclear whether the passage refers to humanity before the deluge, Israel before the exile, or the "nations of the earth" as in Nehemiah.[69] In like manner he observes the wickedness of the people of Sodom: "I have seen all of that" (4Q180 frs. 2-4, 2:9). That Yahweh sees everything — not just outward appearances but the secret motion of the heart — is stated in 11QPs^{a} 28:3-12 with reference to David, a poetic midrash on 1 S. 16:1-13; here *rā'â* parallels two verbs of hearing: "God sees *(r'h)* everything, hears *(šmʿ)* everything, and listens (*'zn* hiphil)" (ll. 7-8).

Two texts speak of God as seeing with compassion. In the context of a historical recapitulation, 4Q504 frs. 1-2, 5:11 says: "He saw our grief and anguish"; in a prayer for God's help, 4Q176 frs. 1-2, 1:3-4 (a *pesher* on Ps. 79:2-3) pleads: "See the corpses of your priests, there is none to bury them." A paraphrase of Ex. 24:6-8, borrowing from Gen. 12:1 and Dt. 34:4, speaks of the sacrificial site "that I showed Abraham and . . ." (4Q158 4:6). In anguish the psalmist feels cut off from all possibility of life, and complains, "You will never again let me see good" (4Q381 33:10; or: "My life will never again see good"). To those who put their trust in Yahweh, "he will show the happiness of his elect" (4Q380 1:10).

Yahweh's salvation is grounded in his creative act, which is declared (*spr* piel) by his hosts (1QH 13:11) and attested *(r'h)* with rejoicing by his angels (11QPs^{a} 26:12).

---

69. See E. M. Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran. HSS* 28 (1986), 203-4.

But it is Yahweh who granted them this knowledge: "You showed (*r'h* hiphil) them what they did not know *(yd')*" (11QPs^a 26:12; cf. 1QH 13:11). At the eschaton Yahweh will build an indestructible sanctuary, with a promise of his enduring presence. It may be entered only by those who bear the name "holy": "and he himself will appear over it forever" (4QFlor 1:5).

In combination with *pānîm, mar'â* means "mirror." The swords and shields of the warriors arrayed for the eschatological battle are "bright as mirrors" (1QM 5:4-5,11). The wheeled basin at the altar of burnt offering is fashioned entirely of "mirrors" (11QT 3:16; cf. Ex. 38:8; presumably *lr'wt* is a corruption of *mr'wt*), i.e., polished bronze. The vision of God's glory *(mr't kbwd)* is mentioned in 1Q34 fr. 3, 2:6: "You will renew your covenant through the vision of your glory and the words of your holy spirit."

Used absolutely, *mar'eh* means "appearance." In a poetic recapitulation of 1 S. 16:4ff., 11QPs^a 26:8-9 says of David: "He was handsome in figure *(tw'r)* and handsome in appearance." According to 1QM 6:13, all the horses that go out to battle are identical in appearance. The phrase *mar'ê šibbōleṯ*, "the shape of an ear of wheat," is a technical term (1QM 5:11; cf. 4Q405 frs. 20-22, 2:10). The vision of God *(mr'h h'lwhym)* is mentioned in 4Q160 fr. 1, 5: "Let me know the vision of God" (cf. 4Q160 frs. 3-4, 1:6).

2. *LXX*. The LXX generally uses *ideín, horán,* or *blépein* to translate the qal of *rā'â,* without discernible distinction. It always renders the deictic impv. *r^e'ēh* as *idoú*. For specialized nuances it uses other verbs such as *akoueín* (Jer. 2:31), *anangéllein* (Isa. 30:10), *(apo)deiknýnai* (Nu. 22:41; 24:17; Dt. 32:20; 1 K. 13:12; Isa. 53:11; Jer. 18:17; Est. 2:9), *eipeín* (Lam. 3:36), *heurískein* (Jgs. 18:9), *katanoeín* (Gen. 42:9; Ex. 2:11; 19:21; Nu. 32:8,9; Isa. 5:12), and *sṓzein* (Est. 8:6).

The niphal is represented by appropriate forms of *horán* and *ideín,* as well as the following verbs: *heurískein* (Jgs. 6:12), *gígnesthai* (2 K. 23:24), *dēloún* (1 S. 3:21 [different original text], *entrépein* (Isa. 16:12), *katabaínein* (Dt. 31:15 [different original]), and *phaínein* (1 K. 6:18; Isa. 47:3; Dnl. 1:13,15).

The hiphil is represented by *deiknýein* or *deiknýnai,* except in Ex. 33:18 *(emphanízein)* and Jgs. 13:23 *(phōtízein)*. For theological reasons the LXX altered the texts that speak of a vision of God apart from theophanies and visions (Ex. 24:10-11; Isa. 38:11; Ps. 63:3[2]; Job 19:26-27; 33:26; cf. Ps. 11:7; 17:15), substituting another object for "God" (Ex. 24:10: the place where God appears; Isa. 38:11: God's salvation), translating a different text (Job), or using a passive construction: "appear before God." In particular the passive was used for the expression "see the face of God" in the sense of "visit the temple" (Ex. 23:15,17; 34:20,23-24; Dt. 16:16; Isa. 1:12; Ps. 42:3[2]; cf. Ps. 84:8[7]). Following the lead of the LXX, the Masoretes substituted the niphal of *r'h* for the qal.[70]

Fuhs

---

70. Fritsch; Smith, 173-74.

רְאֵם *r^e'ēm*; רֵים *rêm*; רְאֵים *r^e'êm*

I. Semitic Equivalents: 1. Akkadian and Sumerian; 2. Ugaritic; 3. Old Aramaic; 4. South Semitic. II. Ancient Hebrew: 1. OT; 2. Other Texts. III. Versions.

I. Semitic Equivalents. The Hebrew primary noun *r^e'ēm* derives from the Common Semitic *qiṭl* form **ri'm,* as is shown by the occasional Akkadian writing *ri'-mu*[1] and Arab. *ri'm^un* (alongside *rīm^un*). Metathesis of ' and **i* in nouns with ' as the second radical is common.[2] A feminine form appears only in Akkadian: *rīmu(m)* vs. *rīmtu(m).*[3] The Heb. fem. PN *r^e'ûmâ* in Gen. 22:24 is unrelated,[4] although there may be a connection with the form chosen by the LXX^L recension, along with the scribal error Ρεηρα in LXX^A. Also unrelated to *r^e'ēm* are *rā'môt* (I), "corrals(?)," and the verbal form *w^erā'^amâ,* "will be high," in Zec. 14:10b (cf. *r'm* in *KAI,* 279.3, which Donner reads as the masc. sg. act. qal ptcp. of *rûm,* with ' as *mater lectionis*).[5] We have no information about the etymology of the toponym *rā'môṯ* (II) associated with many geographical sites.

1. *Akkadian and Sumerian.* Akk. *rīmu(m)* I (Assyr. *rēmu* II) and the fem. *rīmtu(m)* have been identified since Hilzheimer as meaning "wild ox, aurochs" *(Bos primigenius).*[6] The Sumerian equivalent *am* has the same meaning.[7] The aurochs, the ancestor of the domestic ox, was wild game, hunted especially by the Neo-Assyrian kings;[8] by contrast, the arna or wild water buffalo *(Bubalis arnee;* domestic species: *Bos bubalis),* which many identify with Heb. *r^e'ēm* and is clearly meant by Akk. *apsasû* < Sum. *abzaza,* was not native to Mesopotamia, but was known only as an import from the Indus region from the time of Sargon I to approximately the time of Šusin.[9] The

---

r^e'ēm. E. Bilik, "The Re'em," *BethM* 54 (1972/73) 382-86; B. Clark, "The Biblical Oryx," *BAR* 10/5 (1984) 66-70; M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography X," *Bibl* 53 (1972) 386-403, esp. 389; Y. Felix, "Ox, Oryx, Bull," *Leš* 44 (1979/80) 124-36; A. H. Godbey, "The Unicorn in the OT," *AJSL* 56 (1939) 256-96; J. J. Hess, "Beduinisches zum Alten und Neuen Testament," *ZAW* 35 (1915) 120-31, esp. 121-23; J. W. Klotz, "The Lion and the Unicorn," *Concordia Journal* 5/6 (1979) 213-15; G. Rausing, "The Ancestry of the Unicorn," *Meddelanden från Lunds Universitets Historiska Museum 1971-1972* (London, 1973) 188-97; A. Salonen, *Jagd und Jagdtiere im alten Mesopotamien. AnAcScFen* B/196 (1976).

1. *MSL,* VIII/2, 74:49.
2. *BLe,* §61c″.
3. On the absence of endings in the Hebrew names for animals, see Michel, I, 74.
4. See I.2 below.
5. *KAI,* II, 336.
6. M. Hilzheimer, *Die Wildrinder im alten Mesopotamien. MAOG* II/1 (1926); B. Landsberger, *Die Fauna im alten Mesopotamien. ASAW* 42/6 (1934), esp. 89; *AHw,* II, 986; Salonen, 247-50.
7. Salonen, 167-74; on the figurative usage of *am* in literature, see W. Heimpel, *Tierbilder in der sumerischen Literatur* (Rome, 1968), 79-121.
8. J. Clutton-Brock, *Sumer* 36 (1980) 37-41; W. Heimpel, *RLA,* V, 234-35.
9. R. M. Boehmer, *ZA* 64 (1975) 1-19.

terms for the impressive and dangerous wild ox, with its long, menacing horns (cf. the lexical entry *am.gub.ba,* etc. = *qar-na-nu,* "having large horns," as well as the examples in Heimpel; also Dt. 33:17[10]), serve as epithets for gods and kings.[11] A temple may be called *bît rīm mātātim,* "house of the wild ox of the lands [viz., Enlil]" or simply *rīmum,* "wild ox."[12] In Sumerian a temple can be compared to an *am,* "wild ox."[13]

H.-P. Müller

2. *Ugaritic.* The model of Sem. **ri'm* indicates that Ugar. *r'm* should be vocalized as *ri'mu,* with ' representing syllable-ending *aleph.* Earlier interpretations suggesting that *r'm* has *u* as a thematic vowel (*ru'mu* or *ru'-maum,*[14] corresponding to Masoretic *r^e'ûmâ* in Gen. 22:24) may be considered outmoded.

Ugar. *r'm* also means "wild ox";[15] here too "water buffalo" is impossible.[16] The wild ox was common in ancient Syria; it was considered the embodiment of unbridled strength, and was often hunted.[17] One text speaks of "a bowl . . . on which are (depicted) myriads of wild oxen," recalling a Late Bronze gold bowl from Ugarit, depicting a royal hunt for wild oxen and antelopes.[18]

Mythological texts use the word *r'm* with some frequency. The cow of the goddess ʿAnat "bore a bull (*'br*) for Baal, a wild ox (*r'm*) for the Cloud Rider."[19] Baal hunted these animals "on the shores of Šmk, which is full of wild oxen."[20] After Baal's death, ʿAnat sacrifices seventy wild oxen, as well as many other wild and domestic animals.[21] "The strongest sinews of a wild ox" are employed to make a bow for ʿAnat.[22] Along with other dangerous animals, "wild oxen" serve as metaphors for the battling gods Mot and Baal.[23] To describe Mot's appetite, another text speaks of "a pond to which wild oxen (long to) come, a spring at which hinds (*'ylt*) long to arrive."[24]

J. Tropper — H.-P. Müller

---

10. See *MSL,* VIII/2, 10:50a-52; Heimpel, *Tierbilder,* 81-97, 103, 121. See also II.1 below.

11. For Sum. *am* see Salonen, 168ff.; for Akk. *rīmu(m)/rīmtu(m)* see K. L. Tallqvist, *Akkadische Götter-Epitheta* (Helsinki, 1938), 165-66; *AHw,* II, 986; Salonen, 248ff. For royal epithets see Seux, 250, 386; *AHw,* II, 986; Salonen.

12. For the former see *Altorientalische Bibliothek,* 22, III:7; for the latter see *RA,* 64, 95:5, 161; *AHw,* II, 986.

13. Heimpel, *Tierbilder,* 83-87.

14. For the former see Z. S. Harris, *JAOS* 57 (1937) 151; for the latter see H. L. Ginsberg, *Or* 5 (1936) 185; D. Marcus, *JANES* 1 (1968) 54 n. 45.

15. J. C. de Moor, *Seasonal Patterns in the Ugaritic Myth of Ba'lu. AOAT* 16 (1971), 199.

16. Cf. H. L. Ginsberg, *JANES* 5 (1973) 131 n. 4.

17. *KTU,* 1.10, II, 9, 12.

18. *KTU,* 1.4, I, 41-43; for the bowl see *Syr* 15 (1934) pl. 16, reproduced in *BRL*², 151.

19. *KTU,* 1.10, III, 21(36).

20. *KTU,* 1.10, II, 9, 12; on the construction see E. Verreet, *UF* 18 (1986) 381-82.

21. *KTU,* 1.6, I, 19.

22. *KTU,* 1.17, VI, 21.

23. *KTU,* 1.6, VI, 18.

24. *KTU,* 1.5, I, 17; cf. 1.133, 7. On the translation see Verreet, 381.

3. *Old Aramaic.* In the third line of the Old Aramaic inscription of King Aśoka (268-233 B.C.E.), from Kandahar (Afghanistan), the word *r'm* is disputed both textually and semantically.[25] Textually clear but semantically obscure is the expression *br'mn 2 pthn* in the ledger of a Jewish merchant in early Hellenistic Egypt.[26] In 11QtgJob 39:9-10 Heb. *r^e'ēm* is represented by *r'm̊*.The word *wrym*[ʾ] in Aram. En. 89:6 is discussed elsewhere.[27] The Syrian version uses Syr. *raymā'* not only for *r^e'ēm,* but also for *dîšôn* (I), "a kind of antelope (?), bison (?)," in Dt. 14:5.

4. *South Semitic.* The meaning of Arab. *ri'm^{un}/rīm^{un}*, "white antelope *(Antilope leucoryx)*,"[28] is purely metonymic and has no bearing on Hebrew usage. For example, Hess suggests that a semantic shift from "wild ox" to "gazelle" (!) is occasioned by the fact that both are white. In Ethiopic (Geez) *rĕ'îm/rĕ'ēm* means "wild bull, rhinoceros, unicorn."[29] Hommel is probably correct in calling the form a borrowing from Hebrew, especially in light of the phonetic variant *rĕ'ēm;* the borrowed meaning would support this theory.[30]

II. Ancient Hebrew. For Heb. *r^e'ēm,* too, the exegetical evidence suggests "wild ox" as the most likely meaning.[31] The theory (based on Arabic) that it means "white antelope" overlooks the fact that lexical equivalents can have different meanings in individual languages.[32] It is true that the more slender animal, like the wild ox, was hunted by kings;[33] but — especially because there are other Hebrew terms for various species of antelope — it would be unsuitable in the paradox of Job 39:9-12 and probably also as representative of a hostile world in Isa. 34:7 and Ps. 22:22(21). The water buffalo and bison, unlike the wild ox, had probably vanished from Syria too long before the 1st millennium to be a vivid memory.[34] In a positive sense, *r^e'ēm* symbolizes laudable strength (Nu. 23:22; 24:8; Dt. 33:17; Ps. 92:11[10]; 1 En. 90:38 cj.); representing hostile powers, it has negative valence (Isa. 34:7; Ps. 22:22[21]; Job 39:9-12); the occurrences in Ps. 29:6 and Aram. En. 89:6 are neutral.

1. *OT.* In the OT comparison to a *r^e'ēm* — like all animal comparisons — appears first in sayings characterizing tribes or nations. In Dt. 33:17a, a predicative clause that has no counterpart in the Joseph saying in Gen. 49:22-26, the subject of the predication

---

25. *KAI,* 279.
26. *AP,* 81.110.
27. See II.2 below.
28. Lane, I/3, 1204.
29. W. Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez* (Wiesbaden, 1987), 458.
30. F. Hommel, *Die Namen der Säugthiere bei den südsemitischen Völkern* (Leipzig, 1879), 367.
31. *GesB,* 736-37; *BDB,* 910; König, 426; *KBL*^{2}, 864-65; *KBL*^{3}.
32. Contra S. Bochart, *Hierozoicon* (London, 1683); cf. F. S. Bodenheimer, *Animal and Man in Bible Lands* (Leiden, 1960), 53.
33. See I.1 above and the bowl from Ugarit described in I.2 above.
34. On the water buffalo see *GesTh,* III, 1248-49; but cf. I.1 above. On the bison see K. Budde.

— the tribe of Joseph (?) or Ephraim (?)[35] — is called a "firstborn bull," whose horns are the horns of a r^e'ēm,[36] with which he gores "(the) peoples" and "the ends of the earth" (the goring wild ox is common metaphor in Sumerian literature[37]). In this metaphorical language with overtones of magic, both the domestic ox *(šôr)* and its wild counterpart *(r^e'ēm)* portray the tribe's invincibility in battle.[38]

The first of the two older Balaam oracles over Jacob/Israel (Nu. 24:8a) contains the expression *k^eṯô'^{a}pôṯ r^e'ēm lô.* Here *r^e'ēm* serves either as a predicate of Jacob/Israel ("he [El] has as it were the horns of the wild ox")[39] or as a metaphor for El, who here brings Israel out of Egypt ("like the horns of a *r^e'ēm* is he [El] to him [Jacob/Israel]").[40] The latter interpretation recalls Akk. *rīmu(m)/rīmtu(m)* used as a divine epithet and Ugar. *r'm* as a metaphor for deities. In either case it is Jacob/Israel on whom — as in Dt. 33:17a — the strength of the *r^e'ēm* bestows superiority in battle over "(the) nations that are his foes." Nu. 24:8a is incorporated word for word in the second of the two later Balaam oracles (23:22). There is no reason to doubt that in Dt. 33:17a; Nu. 24:8; 23:22 *r^e'ēm,* like Akk. *rīmu(m)* and Ugar. *r'm,* refers to the aggressive wild ox, characterized in Akkadian texts as *kadru,* "proud, impetuous."[41]

The noun *r^e'ēm* occurs three times in the Psalms; here the usage is less specific. In the context of a hymn, Ps. 29:6 describes the storm god Yahweh as making Lebanon skip "like a calf" and Sirion "like a young wild ox" *(k^emô ḇen-r^e'ēmîm);* cf. Akk. *rīmu(m)* as an epithet of Ellil and Ugar. *r'm* in connection with Baal.[42] The mention of wild oxen in connection with Lebanon and Sirion may be due to the presence of these animals there; the Assyrian king Ashur-bel-kala hunted wild oxen in regions as distant as Lebanon.[43]

Ps. 92:11a(10a) is a narrative clause in a hymnic psalm of thanksgiving; it both expresses and explains the speaker's trust, using the singular metaphor "my horn" to refer to the psalmist so as to add the vivid *kir'ēm,* "like (that of) the wild ox." In individual laments and thanksgivings, the "enemies," whom we met already in Nu. 24:8 and Dt. 33:17, are now the unspecified enemies of the devout individual and of Yahweh (vv. 10,12[9,11]).

In Ps. 22:22b(21b), an individual lament, the *rēmîm* follow the dog (v. 21b[20b]) and the lion (v. 22a[21a]), representing the forces that threaten the psalmist, who prays for God's defense against these hostile powers, which are introduced by the catchword "sword" (v. 21a[20a]).

---

35. H.-J. Zobel, *Stammesspruch und Geschichte. BZAW* 95 (1965), 37.
36. See I.1 above.
37. See the examples in Heimpel, *Tierbilder,* 97-101, 104-5.
38. On the juxtaposition of *šôr* and *r^e'ēm* cf. Ugar. *r'm* in *KTU,* 1.17, VI, 21 and 23; see M. Dahood, *RSP,* I, 334, no. 508.
39. M. Noth, *Numbers. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1968), 170.
40. Cf. NRSV and many other versions.
41. *MSL,* VIII/2, 10:50a (see I.1 above); *AHw,* I, 419; *CAD,* K, 32; for Sumerian parallels see Heimpel, *Tierbilder,* 104-7.
42. For the Akkadian see Tallqvist, *Götter-Epitheta,* 166; for the Ugaritic see I.2 above.
43. W. Heimpel, *RLA,* V, 234.

Isa. 34:7 and Job 39:9-12 name *rᵉʾēmîm* or *rᵉʾēm* along with other impressive and dangerous animals as representatives of a hostile world. In Isa. 34:7 this symbol of menacing power together with domestic cattle (whose mention is redundant) will become a helpless sacrifice to Yahweh on his eschatological day of slaughter, with Edom as the primary target. The paradox asserted in Job 39:9-12 centers on the notion that the wild ox does not behave like its domestic counterpart, the ox; in the context of God's reply to Job, the passage suggests that God can tame the representative of a hostile world.[44]

2. *Other Texts.* The reading *btwʿpwt rʾm* instead of *btwʿpwt twʾr* in Sir. 45:7 (B) reflects a textual corruption based on Nu. 23:22 and 24:8: the resemblance of Jacob/Israel to a wild ox is transferred to Aaron.

In a visionary anticipation of the deluge, Aram. Enoch (= 4QEnᵉ) 89:6 describes Noah's ship "sailing over the surface of the water and all cattle . . . elephants, and wild oxe[n] (*wrymy*[ʾ])." In 1 En. 90:38 *nagar,* "word," makes no sense in the context; one proposal is to substitute Heb. *rʾm,* "which the Greek transcribed as ῥῆμ, read by the Ethiopic as ῥῆμ = *nagar.*"[45] This *rᵉʾēm* may be identified as one of two messianic figures.[46]

III. Versions. The LXX translates *rᵉʾēm* as *monókerōs* everywhere except Isa. 34:7, where it uses *hoi hadroí,* "the strong"; the Vg. uses *unicornis* (Isa. 34:7; Ps. 21[22]:22; 28[29]:6 *iuxta* LXX; 91[92]:11 *iuxta* LXX) or *monoceros* (Ps. 91[92]:11). The source of this translation is disputed. It might have been suggested by (Babylonian) profile images of the wild ox,[47] natural examples like the rhinoceros (note *rhinókerōs* in A and a *héteros*[48] in Job 39:9, *rinoceros* in Vg. of Nu. 23:22; 24:8; Dt. 33:17; Job 39:9-10; Ps. 28[29]:6 *Psalmi iuxta Hebraicum,* and in Saadia's discussion of Job 39:9), fantastic imagery deriving from Hellenistic speculation,[49] or even Dnl. 8:5ff. The AV translation "unicorn" derives from LXX.

H.-P. Müller

44. O. Keel, *Jahwes Entgegnung an Ijob. FRLANT* 121 (1978), 63ff.; H.-P. Müller, *BZ* 32 (1988) 210-31, esp. 218-19.

45. S. Uhlig, *JSHRZ* V/6, 704, following others.

46. M. A. Knibb, *Ethiopic Book of Enoch,* 2 vols. (Oxford, 1978), 2:216.

47. Hess, 121.

48. J. Ziegler, *Iob* (1982), 392.

49. B. Reicke, *BHHW,* III, 2173-74.

רֹאשׁ I *rōʾš* I; רִאשָׁה *riʾšâ;* רֹאשָׁה *rōʾšâ;* מְרַאֲשׁוֹת *mᵉraʾᵃšôṯ*

I. Root and Occurrences. II. Lexical Field: 1. Synonyms; 2. Metonyms; 3. Antonyms; 4. Other Associations; 5. Spatiotemporal Usage. III. Verbal Idioms. IV. Literal Usage: 1. Humans; 2. Animals; 3. God. V. Figurative Usage with Persons: 1. Chief; 2. King; 3. Commander; 4. Other. VI. Figurative Usage with Objects: 1. Spatial; 2. Temporal; 3. Excellence. VII. Anthropology and Theology: 1. Literal Usage; 2. Figurative Usage; 3. Anthropological Usage; 4. Spatial and Temporal Usage. VIII. 1. LXX; 2. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Root and Occurrences. Heb. *rōʾš* is a primary noun deriving from a Common Semitic root generally identified as **raʾš.*[1] Friedrich, however, postulates **ruʾšu,* which developed into the segholate *rōʾeš* with a relatively late audible *aleph.*

The noun is attested in many Semitic languages. It appears already in Old Akkadian as *rāšum,* with the meanings "head, beginning, peak." This became Bab. *rēšu(m)* as a term for the part of the body as well as prominent geographical or architectural features (ridge, peak, pinnacle; bridgehead); it was also used as a temporal term (the beginning of a time period, the first appearance of the new moon, the beginning of a reign or activity) and to denote qualitative features (quality, excellence).[2] Already at Mari we find *rēšu* as a title of high officials (*ša rēši;* cf. Heb. *sārîs*) and military commanders, but

---

rōʾš. L. Alonso Schökel and C. Carniti, "'In tèsta': Is. 35:10," *RivB* 34 (1896) 397-99; J. R. Bartlett, "The Use of the Word ראשׁ as a Title in the OT," *VT* 19 (1969) 1-10; F. Blome, *Die Opfermaterie in Babylonien und Israel* I. *Sacra scriptura antiquitatibus orientalibus illustrata* 4 (Rome, 1934); N. M. Bronznick, "Calque or Semantic Parallel, Which?" *HAR* 1 (1977) 121-29, esp. 127-28; M. Dahood, "Are the Ebla Tablets Relevant to Biblical Research?" *BAR* 6 (1980) 54-60; F. Delitzsch, *System der biblischen Psychologie* (Leipzig, ²1861); P. Dhorme, *L'emploi métaphorique des noms des parties du corps en hébreu et en akkadien* (Paris, 1923); J. Friedrich, "Semitische Kleinigkeiten," *FS A. Dupont-Sommer* (Paris, 1971), 195-99, esp. 195-96; M. I. Gruber, *Aspects of Nonverbal Communication in the Ancient Near East. StPohl* 12/1-2 (1980); A. R. Johnson, *The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel* (Cardiff, 1964); E. Kutsch, "'Trauerbräuche' und 'Selbstminderungsriten' im AT," *ThS* 78 (1965) 23-42 = *Kleine Schriften zum AT. BZAW* 168 (1986), 78-95; H. Leene, *De vroegere en de nieuwe dingen bij Deuterojesaja* (1987); H. Lesétre, "Tête," *DB* V, 2100-2101; J. A. MacCulloch, "Head," *ERE,* VI, 532-40; H.-P. Müller, "ראשׁ *rōš* Kopf," *THAT,* II, 701-15; H. D. Preuss, *Verspottung fremder Religionen im AT. BWANT* 92 (1971); C. Rabin, "*Rôš* as Designation of Substances," *Lešonenu* 40 (1975/76) 85-91; J. J. Rabinowitz, "An Additional Note on בראשׁ," *VT* 9 (1959) 209-10; *idem,* "Demotic Papyri of the Ptolemaic Period and Jewish Sources," *VT* 7 (1957) 398-400; H. Reviv, *The Elders in Ancient Israel* (Jerusalem, 1983) [Heb.]; H. N. Rösel, "Jephtah und das Problem der Richter," *Bibl* 61 (1980) 251-55; *idem,* "Die 'Richter Israels,'" *BZ* 25 (1981) 180-203; V. M. Rogers, "The Use of ראשׁ in an Oath," *JBL* 74 (1955) 272; U. Rüterswörden, *Die Beamten der israelitischen Königszeit. BWANT* 117 (1985); E. A. Speiser, "Census and Ritual Expiation in Mari and Israel," *BASOR* 149 (1958) 20-25; H. W. Wolff, *Anthropology of the OT* (Eng. trans. Philadelphia, 1974); R. Yaron, "Aramaic Marriage Contracts from Elephantine," *JSS* 3 (1958) 1-39.

1. Müller, 701; *HAL.*
2. *AHw,* II, 973-76.

also with the meaning "slave, servant" — perhaps because here (as in Arabic) it functioned as a numeral.

The semantic range of Ugar. *rʾš* (pl. *rʾšm*) is similarly broad.[3] One text speaks of bowing one's head to one's knees as a sign of mourning;[4] cf. 1 K. 18:42.

The Amarna tablets contain the Canaanite gloss *ru-šu-nu* (glossing Akk. *rēšu-nu*).[5] Syr. *rēšā*[6] and Aram. *rēš* (Jewish Aram. *ēʾšā*) extend the semantic range of this root to the notion of money as the principal form of capital,[7] a development attested already in Egyptian Aramaic.[8] The use of *rʾš* as a title is particularly extensive in Aramaic: *rʾš ḥbr*, "leader of the (Jewish) congregation"; *rʾš ʿdt/rʾš šyrʾ*, "leader of the caravan"; etc. Palmyrene exhibits similar usage. The meaning of the word in Moabite is disputed: "leader, elite," or derived from *rāš*, "poor."[9]

The semantic ranges of Mand. *riš*,[10] OSA *rʾs*,[11] Arab. *raʾs* (also meaning "head" of cattle[12]) and *raʾīs*, "chief," and finally Eth. *rĕʾĕs*[13] with its dialectal variants[14] are basically similar. Finally, the root made its way into Egyptian as the loanword *ru-ʾu-š*, where it appears as *pʾ.rš*, "mountain peak."[15]

According to *HAL*, the word occurs 599 times in the MT *(BHK)*; there are 14 additional occurrences of Aram. *rēš*. In three instances the word may represent the name of a region (Ezk. 38:2-3 LXX; 39:1).[16] Even-Shoshan arrives at a total of 600 occurrences by including Ps. 140:10(Eng. 9), where many others interpret *rōʾš* as "poison," and Prov. 13:23.[17] The word is distributed evenly throughout almost all the books of the OT.[18]

Among the derivatives of *rōʾš* we will single out three nouns:[19] *meraʾªšōṯ*, "region of the head, under someone's head" (Gen. 28:11,18; 1 S. 19:13,16; 26:7,11-12,16; 1 K. 19:6) and "head covering" (Jer. 13:18); *rišâ*, "former times" (Ezk. 36:11); *(hāʾeḇen hā)rōʾšâ*, "the top (stone)" (Zec. 4:7: "capstone" or "first stone"?[20]).

3. *WUS*, no. 2472; *UT*, no. 2296; M. Dahood, *RSP*, I, no. 509ff.
4. *KTU*, 1.2, I, 24. Cited by *UT*, no. 1965.
5. EA 264:18.
6. *LexSyr*, 728.
7. *LexHebAram*, 153; Beyer, 689.
8. *AP*, 10.6; 11.5; *DISO*, 269-70.
9. *KAI*, 181.20; see the discussion in *DISO*, 269; and *KAI*, II, 177.
10. *MdD*, 434.
11. ContiRossini, 235; Biella, 474; Beeston, 112.
12. Wehr, 317.
13. *LexLingAeth* 294.
14. *WbTigre*, 155; Leslau, *Cognates*, 102.
15. See W. F. Albright, *The Vocalization of the Egyptian Syllabic Orthography*. *AOS* 5 (1934), 35; *WbÄS*, II, 455.
16. Müller, 703; but see W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*. *Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 305.
17. See also H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1989), 522; cf. M. Dahood, *Psalms 100–150*. *AB* XVIIA (1970), 303-4. Cf. also W. McKane, *Proverbs*. *OTL* (1970), 463: *rāʾšîm* = "chiefs, notables."
18. See the table in Müller, 703.
19. See also → ראשׁון *riʾšôn*; → ראשׁית *rēʾšîṯ*.
20. On the text and its interpretation see W. Rudolph, *Sacharja*. *KAT* XIII/4 (1962), 110-11; for a different view see E. Lipiński, *VT* 20 (1970) 30-33.

II. Lexical Field.

1. *Synonyms.* The lexical field of *rōʾš* in literal usage includes, first, words denoting a portion of head, which can sometimes appear as synonyms of *rōʾš:*

a. → קדקד *qoḏqōḏ,* "top of the head," in parallelism with *rōʾš* (Gen. 49:26; Dt. 33:16; Ps. 7:17[16]; 68:22[21]), interchangeable with *rōʾš* in the expression *mikkap-regel weʿaḏ-rōʾš,* "from the sole of the foot to the head" (Isa. 1:6; cf. Dt. 28:35; 2 S. 14:25; Job 2:7) and also standing for *rōʾš* by synecdoche.

b. The noun *gulgōleṯ,* "skull," in parallelism with *rōʾš* (Jgs. 9:53), interchangeable with *rōʾš* in the expression "per person" (*laggulgōleṯ,* Ex. 16:16; 38:26; Nu. 1:2,18,20,22; 3:47; 1 Ch. 23:3,24; cf. *lerōʾš,* Jgs. 5:30; 1 Ch. 24:4) and standing for *rōʾš* by synecdoche (2 K. 9:35; 1 Ch. 10:10 [cf. v. 9]).

c. Of course we find *rōʾš* in parallelism or collocation with words for parts of the head or nearby parts of the body: → עין *ʿayin,* "eye" (2 K. 9:30; Isa. 29:10; Jer. 8:23[9:1]; Job 2:12); → פנים *pānîm,* "face" (Josh. 7:6); → אף *ʾap̱,* "nose," and *ʾoznayim,* "ears" (Ezk. 16:12); → פה *peh,* "mouth" (Prov. 10:6); *raqqâ,* "temple" (Jgs. 5:26); *maḥlāpôṯ,* "locks of hair" (Jgs. 16:13,19); *ṣîṣiṯ,* "hair of the brow" (Ezk. 8:3); *taltallîm,* "locks" (Cant. 5:11); *dallâ,* "hair of the head" (Cant. 7:6[5]); *śēʿār,* "hair" (2 S. 14:26); *zāqān,* "beard" (Lev. 13:29; Isa. 15:2; Jer. 48:37; Ezk. 5:1; Ps. 133:2; Ezr. 9:3); → קרן *qeren,* "horn" (the topmost part of some animal species, Zec. 2:4[1:21]; Dnl. 7:20); *gargerôṯ,* "neck" (Prov. 1:9); *kāṯēp̱,* "shoulder" (Ezk. 29:18).

2. *Metonyms.* Second, *rōʾš* itself occasionally stands by metonymy for the hair of the head in the context of (ritual) hairdressing (Lev. 13:29-30; 14:29; 19:27; 21:10; Nu. 6:9; Dt. 21:12; 32:42; Jgs. 13:5; 2 S. 2:16; 2 K. 9:30; Isa. 7:20; Ezk. 5:1; 29:18; 44:20; Am. 8:10; Ps. 141:5; Job 1:20).

3. *Antonyms.* Third, many occurrences of *rōʾš* refer to the upper part of the body, in conjunction with antonyms referring to the lower or another part of the body. Examples include → רגל *(kap-) regel,* "foot" (Isa. 1:6; Ezk. 24:23); → עקב *ʿāqēḇ,* "heel" (Gen. 3:15); *raglayim,* "legs" (1 S. 17:5-6; Isa. 7:20); *zānāḇ,* "tail" (Dt. 28:13,44; Isa. 9:13[14]; 19:15); *gēw* (?), "trunk" (1 S. 5:4 cj.[21]); *ʿôr,* "skin" (Job 40:31); *ʿaṣāmîm,* "bones" (Ezk. 32:27; → עצם); *ṣaḏ,* "side" (2 S. 2:16); *moṯnayim,* "hips" (1 K. 20:31-32; Jer. 48:37; Ezk. 23:15; 44:18; Am. 8:10); → *zerôaʿ,* "arm" (2 S. 1:10); *ʾaṣṣîlê-yāḏayîm,* "wrists" (Ezk. 13:18).

4. *Other Associations.* Finally, *rōʾš* occurs in the context of → בגד *beḡeḏ,* "clothing," when both are the object of similar actions, usually symbolic (cleansing, anointing, etc.) (Josh. 7:6; 1 S. 4:12; 17:5,38; 2 S. 1:2; 13:19; 15:32; 1 K. 20:31-32; Isa. 15:2-3; 58:5; 59:17; Jer. 48:37; Ezk. 7:18; 23:15; 27:30-31; 44:18; Am. 8:10; Zec. 3:5; Ps. 133:2; Eccl. 9:8; Lam. 2:10). It also appears in the context of → נזר *nēzer,* "crown," and *miṣnepeṯ,* "turban" (Ex. 29:6; Lev. 8:9; 2 S. 1:10; 12:30; Ezk. 16:12; 23:15; Zec.

---

21. See *BHS.*

3:5; 6:11; Ps. 21:4[3]; Job 19:9; Lam. 5:16; Est. 2:17; 6:8; 1 Ch. 20:2), as well as → שׁמן *šemen*, "oil" (Ex. 29:7; Lev. 8:12; 21:10; 1 S. 10:1; 2 K. 9:6; Ps. 23:5; 141:5; Eccl. 9:8).

5. *Spatiotemporal Usage.* When *rōʾš* has spatial meaning — i.e., when it denotes one end of an object in contrast to the other — it appears in conjunction with several terms: (a) in the geographical sense with *gêʾ*, "valley," and → עמק *ʿēmeq*, "plain" (Josh. 15:8); *gayʾ*, "valley," and *śāḏeh*, "field" (Nu. 21:20; cf. 23:14,28; Dt. 3:27; 34:1); *nāweh*, "pasture" (Am. 1:2); → עין *ʿayin*, "spring" (Josh. 15:9); *qarqaʿ hayyām*, "bottom of the sea" (Am. 9:3); → דרך *dereḵ*, "way" (Jgs. 9:25); (b) in the architectural sense with → יסד *yᵉsôd*, "foundation (of a house)" (Hab. 3:13); *yarkâ*, "bottom (of the tabernacle)" (Ex. 26:23-24; 36:27-30); *ʾeḏen*, "base" (Ex. 36:38; 38:17). When *rōʾš* has a temporal meaning, denoting the beginning of a period of time, mention of the end is very uncommon (Eccl. 3:11; also Isa. 48:16: "at the time it comes to be").

III. Verbal Idioms. There are many verbal idioms with *rōʾš* in which the word is used literally but the action itself has anthropological significance. In such expressions *rōʾš* is rarely the subject: only with *ngʿ* hiphil in Job 20:6, *nwʾ* hiphil in Ps. 141:5 (if the text is not corrupt[22]), *ʿāmaḏ* in 2 K. 6:31, and *rûm* in Ps. 27:6. It is almost always the object, so that the head serves as a medium of human expression and relationship for the person in question and others. Such expressions include "shaving" the head as a sign of mourning (*gāzaz*, Job 1:20) or as a ritual of ambiguous significance (*gillaḥ*, Nu. 6:9,18; Dt. 21:12; Isa. 7:20); "anointing" *(diššēn)* as a token of honor and cheer (Ps. 23:5); "endangering" (*ḥîēḇ*, Dnl. 1:10; Sir. 11:18); "covering" *(ḥāpâ)* as a sign of impending death (2 S. 15:30; Jer. 14:3-4; Est. 6:12); "covering" *(kissâ)* as a gesture of disfavor (Isa. 29:10); "shortening" *(kāsam)* as an element of priestly ministry (Ezk. 44:20);[23] "tossing" (*nûaʿ* hiphil) as a gesture of scorn (2 K. 19:21 = Isa. 37:22; Ps. 22:8[7]; 109:25; Job 16:4; Lam. 2:15; Sir. 12:18; 13:7); "shaking" *(nûḏ)*, which most consider a gesture of sympathy but some consider an expression of hostile mockery (Jer. 18:16; Ps. 44:15[14]);[24] "raising" one's own head as an act of pride and independence (Jgs. 8:28; Zec. 2:4[1:21]; Job 10:15; Ps. 83:3[2]) or "lifting up" the head of another in the sense of restoration to rank or office (Gen. 40:13,19-20; 2 K. 25:27 = Jer. 52:31);[25] "raising" (*rûm* hiphil) in the same sense (Ps. 3:4[3]; 110:7; 140:9[8] cj.;[26] Sir. 38:3); "lowering" to the earth (*yāraḏ* hiphil + *lāʾāreṣ*, Lam. 2:10) and "letting hang" (*kāpap*, Isa. 58:5) as a sign of self-abasement; "going over" *(ʿāḇar)* in the sense of "covering" (Ps. 38:5[4]); "disheveling" *(pāraʿ)* the hair of one's head as a mourning ritual (Lev. 10:6; 13:45; 21:10; Nu. 5:18).

The head plays an equally important role in mourning rites and rites of self-

---

22. See comms.
23. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, 460.
24. For the former → נוד *nûḏ* II.2; for the latter see comms.
25. → נשׂא *nāśāʾ*. But see VI.3 below.
26. See comms.

abasement because ultimately to the Israelite both forms of ritual behavior have the same meaning. "Abasement" may be carried out by the person abased or by others; it can also be the result of an external event.[27] As the most prominent part of the body from an anthropological perspective, the head was probably the most appropriate object of such ritual actions. This also explains why the head plays a central role in rituals that can be considered the opposite of "rites of abasement" (exaltation, appointment to office, etc.).[28]

The word plays a similar role in verbal expressions with a preposition; here the anthropological significance is based on metonymy: the "head" stands as *pars pro toto* for the morally responsible individual. First is the realm of liability and restitution: human deeds "turn back" on the head of the doers (*šûb* qal or hiphil; with *bᵉ*, Nu. 5:7; 1 S. 25:39; 1 K. 2:33,44; Joel 4:4,7[3:4,7]; Ob. 15; Ps. 7:17[16]; with *ʿal*, 1 K. 2:32; Est. 9:25; with *ʾel*, Neh. 3:36) or the doers "bring" it on their own heads (*nāṯan bᵉ*, 1 K. 8:32; Ezk. 9:10; 11:21; 16:43; 17:19; 22:31; 2 Ch. 6:23); blood[29] that has been shed weighs on the head of the murderer (with *bᵉ*, Josh. 2:19; 1 K. 2:37; Ezk. 33:4; with *ʿal*, 2 S. 1:16; cf. Lev. 13:44). Second is the realms of blessing and cursing: a blessing may "come" (*hāyâ lᵉ*, Gen. 49:26; *bôʾ lᵉ*, Dt. 33:16) or "rest" (nominal clause with *ʿal*, Prov. 10:6; 11:26; Sir. 44:23; cf. Gen. 48:14,17-18), and wrath "falls upon" the head of someone who is cursed (*ḥûl ʿal*, 2 S. 3:29; Jer. 23:19; 30:23). Third, in the realm of mourning and penance, the head is strewn with "dust" (→ עפר *ʿāp̄ār*) and "ashes" (*ʾēp̄er*) (Josh. 7:6; 2 S. 13:19; Ezk. 27:30; Job 2:12).

IV. Literal Usage.

1. *Humans.* In literal usage most of the occurrences of *rōʾš* refer to the human head. Only rarely is the word used purely descriptively (Dt. 28:23; 2 K. 2:3,5; Eccl. 2:14); almost always the text involves areas in which the "head" is the object (rarely subj.) of actions or functions evoking fundamental human experiences. We may distinguish the following contexts: (a) war and violence: Dt. 32:42; Jgs. 5:26; 7:25; 9:53; 1 S. 17:46,51,54,57; 29:4; 31:9; 2 S. 2:16; 4:7-8,12; 16:9; 20:21-22; 2 K. 6:31-32; 10:6ff.; Am. 9:1 (unless the word is from *rōʾš*, "poison," or should be read as *raʿaš*, "earthquake"[30]); Hab. 3:14; Ps. 68:22[21]; 110:6; 1 Ch. 10:9; (b) peril and security: Gen. 40:16-17,19-20; 2 K. 4:19; Isa. 1:5-6; Jon. 2:6(5); 4:6,8; Ps. 66:12; Job 20:6; 29:3; (c) rites of self-abasement and degradation: Dt. 21:12; Josh. 7:6; 1 S. 4:12; 2 S. 1:2; 13:19; 15:30,32; 1 K. 20:31-32; Isa. 15:2; 58:5; Jer. 8:23(9:1); 14:3-4; 48:37; Ezk. 7:18; 9:10; 27:30; Job 1:20; 2:12; Lam. 2:10; Ezr. 9:3; (d) garments (protective): 1 S. 17:5,38; Isa. 59:17; (official): Ex. 29:6; 2 S. 1:10; 12:30; Ezk. 44:18; Zec. 3:5; 6:11; Ps. 21:4[3]; Est. 2:17; 6:8; (decorative): 2 K. 9:30; Ezk. 16:12; 23:15,42; 24:23; 32:27; Job 19:9; Prov. 1:9; 4:9; Lam. 5:16; (e) anointing (for various purposes): Lev. 8:9,12; 21:10; 1 S. 10:1; 2 K. 9:3,6; Ps. 23:5; 133:2; 141:5; Eccl. 9:8; (f) diagnosis, purifica-

27. See Kutsch, 84-85.
28. See VII below.
29. → דם *dām*.
30. See, respectively, F. Horst, *EvT* 20 (1960) 196; W. Rudolph, *Amos. KAT* XIII/2 (1971), 242.

tion, and declaration of guilt: Lev. 13:12,29,40-41; 14:9,18,29; 24:14; (g) blessing and retribution: Gen. 48:14,17-18; 49:26; Dt. 33:16; Prov. 10:6; 11:26 and 1 K. 2:32-33; Ezk. 16:43; Prov. 25:22; 1 Ch. 12:20(19); (h) sacral and secular hairdressing: Nu. 6:5,7,9,11; Jgs. 13:5; 16:13,17,19,22; 1 S. 1:11; 2 S. 14:26; 18:9; Isa. 7:20; Ezk. 5:1; 8:3; 44:20; Ps. 40:13[12]; Cant. 5:2; (i) erotic description: Cant. 2:6; 5:11; 7:6(5); 8:3; (j) magic: Ezk. 13:18; (k) oaths: 1 Ch. 12:20(19) (Rogers: "By our heads! He might desert to his master Saul!").

2. *Animals.* When used with reference to animals, *rōʾš* usually occurs in a sacrificial context (Ex. 12:9; 29:10,15,17,19; Lev. 1:4,8,12,15; 3:2,8,13; 4:11,15,24,29,33; 8:14,18,20,22; 9:13; 16:21). Although general Semitic usage singles out the head (like the heart) of the sacrificial animal as a precious gift to the deity, reflecting the recognized importance of the human head, in Israel there is no emphasis on either the head or the heart in sacrificial legislation or in accounts of sacrifice; the sacrificial portions are identified instead as the blood, the kidneys, and the fat. The head is mentioned only in lists of the portions burned upon the altar or outside the camp, without being singled out for special treatment as a preferred sacrificial object (Ex. 12:9; Lev. 1:8-9,12-13; 4:11-12). Even in the ritual act of laying hands on the head of the sacrificial animal, the head merely represents the whole animal (Lev. 1:4; 3:2,8,13; 4:4; 8:18).[31]

In other contexts the head of an animal is mentioned purely objectively (Gen. 3:15; Job 40:31[41:7]) or derogatorily (2 S. 3:8; 2 K. 6:25). In the mythological and supernatural domain, the text speaks of the "heads" of the dragon and Leviathan (Ps. 74:13-14), of the third beast (Dnl. 7:6), of the living creatures (Ezk. 1:22,25-26), and the cherubim (Ezk. 10:1). Here again the word possesses its usual valence, deriving from the perspective of anthropology.

3. *God.* Only one text (Dnl. 7:9) speaks of the head of God,[32] but several mention the heads of idols. In 1 S. 5:3-4 Dagon, the god of the Philistines, is first forced to acknowledge Yahweh's superiority by falling down before the ark, the symbol of the apparently defeated God of Israel (v. 3); the second time, however, he loses his head and hands and is thus proved incapable of thought or action (v. 4). On the one hand, we see here an example of the bitter religious polemic found also in other narratives and in prophecy (Jgs. 17–18; 1 K. 18:19-40; 2 K. 1:1-8; Isa. 44:9-20; 46:1-7), as well as in the language of prayer (Ps. 97:7; 115:5-8), which seeks to represent the intellectual and physical inability of the gods to save.[33] On the other hand, this narrative also uses military motifs, for Dagon's second fall is like that of a slain warrior, whose head and hands have been cut off by an unidentified opponent to prove that he is actually dead (cf. 1 S. 17:49-54; 2 S. 4:7-8).[34]

---

31. Blome, 173-75, 418.

32. See VII below.

33. Preuss, 74-80.

34. For ancient Near Eastern parallels see *ANET*³, 233, 241, 277; *ANEP,* nos. 318, 340, 348. See also A. H. van Zijl, *I Samuel. POT,* 85-86.

The head of the statue in Nebuchadnezzar's dream in Dnl. 2 (vv. 32,38) also suggests a polemic against other gods,[35] although the great statue that appears to Nebuchadnezzar does not represent a deity but a succession of historical eras. The materials — gold, silver, iron, and clay — of which the statue is made represent the declining trajectory of the successive empires, effectively symbolizing a rationalistic attack on the deification of rulers (cf. Dnl. 5:4). The real power of history is embodied in the cut-out rock, a symbol of Yahweh (Dt. 32:4,15), that destroys the statue and becomes a mountain filling the whole earth (Dnl. 2:35). The head of gold, symbolizing the Babylonian Empire (v. 38), receives its power from the God of heaven alone, to whose everlasting kingdom it must give way (v. 44).[36]

V. Figurative Usage with Persons.

1. *Chief.* The noun *rōʾš* is frequently used figuratively to designate a person who is the "chief" or "leader" of a social group. Such an "office" appears to be rooted originally in tribal structures, within which it denotes someone who exercises military and juridical authority. Most important, however, is its integrative function: the chief is responsible for the well-being and common life of the community; Jgs. 11:4-11 even distinguishes the chief from the military commander *(qāṣîn).*[37] With the disappearance of tribal structures, somehow the title together with its functions — the juridical more than the military — gradually penetrated other social organizations.[38] We find the following specific applications:

a. Tribal chief, in combination with words meaning "tribe" or "clan" (*rāʾšê hammaṭṭôṯ,* Nu. 30:2[1]; 1 K. 8:1; 2 Ch. 5:2; *rāʾšê šiḇṭêḵem,* Dt. 1:13,15; 5:23; 29:9; *rāʾšê ʾalpê yiśrāʾēl,* Nu. 1:16; 10:4; Josh. 22:21,30), or with the name of the tribe or its eponymous ancestor (Jgs. 10:18; 11:8-11;[39] Mic. 3:1,9; 1 Ch. 11:42; 2 Ch. 28:12).

b. Family head, usually in combination with words meaning "ancestral house" (*bêṯ ʾăḇôṯ,* Ex. 6:14,25; Nu. 1:4; 7:2; 17:18[3]; Josh. 22:14; 1-2 Chronicles passim; or simply *hāʾāḇôṯ,* Ezr. 2:68; 3:12; 4:2-3; 8:1; 10:16; Neh. 7:70; 8:13; 11:13; 12:12,22-23), occasionally with additional qualification (Nu. 25:15; 31:26; 32:28; 36:1; Josh. 14:1; 19:51; 21:1; Ezr. 1:5; 2 Ch. 19:8), or in combination with words denoting hereditary professions (priests, Neh. 12:7; Levites, Neh. 12:24), or with the name(s) of the individual(s) in question (Ezr. 8:16-17; 1 Ch. 5:7,12; 7:3; 9:17; 12:3,19[18]; 16:5; 23:8,11,16,20,24; 26:10,31; 2 Ch. 24:6).

c. Head(s) of the people as a whole (*ʿām,* Ex. 18:25; Nu. 25:4; Dt. 33:5,21; Job 12:24; Neh. 10:15[14]; according to Bartlett also 1 K. 21:9,12; Job 29:25;[40] [*benê*] *yiśrāʾēl,* Nu. 13:3; Josh. 23:2; 24:1).

---

35. Preuss, 256-60.
36. J.-C. Lebram, *ZBK* 23, 55-57.
37. Rösel, "Richter," 203.
38. Bartlett.
39. See Rösel.
40. Pp. 4-5.

d. Unique expressions are "heads of the province" (*mᵉḏînâ,* Neh. 11:3) and "heads of the men" (*gᵉḇārîm,* 1 Ch. 24:4).

When we examine the historical development of official titles, we see that the Chronicler comes to identify *śar* and *rōʾš,* using *śar* in titles that normally require *rōʾš* and vice versa. The result is an irregular choice of words (cf. 1 Ch. 27:22 with 1 S. 15:17; 1 Ch. 21:2 with Nu. 25:4 and Dt. 33:5,21; 2 Ch. 36:14 with Neh. 12:7; vice versa in 1 Ch. 12:15,19,21; irregular: 1 Ch. 11:6).[41]

2. *King.* The embryonic monarchy understood the new office of king as a continuation of the ancient office of tribal chief, using the title *rōʾš* in parallel with *meleḵ* (1 S. 15:17; cf. Job 29:25), but also in a more restricted sense as a functional term for an office of military or forensic leadership (cf. Jgs. 9:7ff. with 10:18; 11:8)[42] and finally in new combinations such as "head of the nations" (2 S. 22:44). This understanding of the royal office continued to shape later thought (1 Ch. 29:11; 2 Ch. 11:22), perhaps as an implicit attack on the division of the kingdom (Hos. 2:2[1:11][43]). The title is also used in reference to alien structures of hegemony (*nᵉśîʾ rōʾš,* Ezk. 38:2-3; 39:1[44]).

Isa. 7:8-9 involves a play on two semantic aspects of the word *rōʾš:* "capital" and "prince," corresponding to Damascus and Samaria, Rezin and Pekah, in cynical contrast to God's own characterization of these kings as "tails" (*zanḇôṯ hāʾûḏîm,* usually translated "stumps") in v. 4, presumably an allusion to a proverb (cf. Isa. 9:13-14[14-15]; 19:15; Dt. 28:13,44: "They shall be the head and you shall be the tail"[45]). The functional peculiarity of *rōʾš* may explain why it exhibits no diachronic development in combination with either *meleḵ* or *nāḡîḏ.*[46]

3. *Commander.* The meaning "military commander" also has its roots in the meaning "tribal chief" (Nu. 14:4; Neh. 9:17). Used in this sense, *rōʾš* can stand by itself (also Ezr. 7:28; 1 Ch. 12:3,33[2,32]), be specified in a military sense as "chief" and "commander" (*śar,* 1 Ch. 11:6; cf. 27:3), or be linked with words for military units such as "chief of the three" or "of the thirty" (2 S. 23:8,13,18; 1 Ch. 11:11,20; 12:19), "chiefs of the thousands" (1 Ch. 12:21[20]), "chiefs of David's warriors (*gibbôrîm*)" (1 Ch. 11:10), and "officers of the army (*ṣāḇāʾ*)" (1 Ch. 12:15[14]).

4. *Other.* Later, *rōʾš* loses the sociological overtones of "tribal chief" and comes to signify the highest-ranking functionary of an official group, above all the "chief priest." This term is always applied to preexilic figures and may retain overtones of juristic authority, as in the ancient tribal office: *kōhēn hārōʾš* (2 K. 25:18; Jer. 52:24 [cf.

41. Rüterswörden, 46-47.
42. → VIII, 355-56; also → IX, 195.
43. H. W. Wolff, *Hosea* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1990), 27.
44. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2,* 305.
45. E. Jacob, *Esais. CAT* VIIIa (1987), 115.
46. See above.

in these texts also the "second priest," *kōhēn hammišneh*]; 1 Ch. 27:5; 2 Ch. 19:11; 24:11; 26:20) and *hakkōhēn hārō'š* (2 Ch. 31:10; Ezr. 7:5), or simply *hārō'š* (2 Ch. 24:6).[47] Other examples of this usage occur sporadically: "leader of praise" (Neh. 11:17, reading *tᵉhillâ* with LXX), "leader of the singers" (*mᵉšōrᵉrîm:* Neh. 12:46). In Isa. 29:10 "your heads, the seers," par. "your eyes, the prophets," is not an instance of technical professional terminology but the explanation of a metaphor. Finally, in Jer. 13:21 and Lam. 1:5, *rō'š* has the general sense of "lord" or "master."

VI. Figurative Usage with Objects.

1. *Spatial.* In figurative usage with respect to objects, the spatial meaning of *rō'š* is very common, especially in the geographical sense. The word is used in the following contexts: (a) tops of mountains (Gen. 8:5; Ex. 17:9-10; 19:20; 24:17; Nu. 14:40,44; 20:28; 21:20; 23:9,14,28; Dt. 3:27; 34:1; Josh. 15:8-9; Jgs. 9:7,25,36-37; 1 S. 26:13; 2 S. 2:25; 15:32; 16:1; 1 K. 18:42; 2 K. 1:9; Isa. 2:2; 28:1,4; 30:17; 42:11; Jer. 22:6; Ezk. 6:13; Hos. 4:13; Joel 2:5; Am. 1:2; 9:3; Mic. 4:1; Ps. 72:16; Cant. 4:8; 2 Ch. 25:12); (b) ends or corners of roads or paths (Isa. 51:20; Ezk. 16:25,31; 21:26[21]; Prov. 1:21; Lam. 2:19; 4:1); (c) overflow of a river (Gen. 2:10); (d) tops of trees and other vegetation (2 S. 5:24; Isa. 17:6; Ezk. 17:4,22; Job 24:24; 1 Ch. 14:15; (e) tops of structures (Gen. 11:4; Jgs. 6:26; Ps. 24:7,9; Prov. 8:2; (f) the head or top of an object (Gen. 28:12; 47:31; Ex. 26:24; 28:32; 36:29,38; 38:17,19; 1 K. 7:16-22,35,41; 8:8; 10:19; Ezk. 10:11; Zec. 4:2; Job 22:12;[48] Prov. 23:34; Est. 5:2; Dnl. 7:1; 2 Ch. 3:15-16; 4:12; 5:9; (g) the head of a group of persons (Dt. 20:9; 1 S. 9:22; 1 K. 21:9,12; Am. 6:7; Mic. 2:13; Job 29:25; 1 Ch. 4:42; 2 Ch. 13:12; 20:27; Ezr. 5:10;[49] likewise in Isa. 35:10; 51:11;[50] (h) in the plural for units of an army (Jgs. 7:16,20; 9:34,43; 1 S. 11:11; 13:17-18; Job 1:17; 1 Ch. 12:24).

2. *Temporal.* Used temporally, *rō'š* can denote the beginning of various periods of time. It appears in combination with "year" *(rō'š haššānâ)* only once in the OT, in Ezk. 40:1, which together with Lev. 25:9 suggests a more ancient Israelite new year, associated with an autumnal date.[51] It also appears in combination with "months," in the sense of the sequence of months (Ex. 12:2: "the beginning of months," i.e., the month of Abib, later called Nisan) as well as in the sense of each individual month, i.e., denoting the "new moon" (presented favorably in Nu. 10:10; 28:11),[52] and with "night watch" (Jgs. 7:19: the time when the watch has just left the illuminated tent, so that their eyes are not yet accustomed to the dark;[53] Lam. 2:19: Zion is to wail aloud, like

---

47. Bartlett, 5ff.

48. But cf. Dahood, 58: not "the highest star(s)" but "the foremost of the stars"; N. Peters, *Das Buch Hiob. EHAT* XXI (1928), 242: "the totality of the stars."

49. But cf. Bartlett, 4-5, for 1 K. 21:9,12, and Job 29:25: "sit as head."

50. See Alonso Schökel and Carniti.

51. J. Begrich, *Die Chronologie der Könige von Israel und Juda. BHT* 3 (1929), 66-90.

52. → IV, 236.

53. A. B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel,* III (Leipzig, 1910), 99.

the sentry crying out at the beginning of every watch[54]). Finally, *rōʾš* denotes the beginning of a series of repeated events (Neh. 12:46; 1 Ch. 16:7), as well as the remote time thought of as the beginning of Israel's existence (Isa. 40:21; 41:4,26; 48:16),[55] and perhaps also time in an absolute sense (Prov. 8:23; Eccl. 3:11); in Prov. 8:26 *rōʾš ʿaprôṯ tēḇēl* means "the first clods of soil" or "the mass of the clods of the earth."[56]

3. *Excellence.* The meaning "peak, top," can also be used in the evaluative sense of "finest, best, supreme," with reference to (a) natural products (Ex. 30:23; Dt. 33:15; Ezk. 27:22; Ps. 118:22 ["chief cornerstone"]; Cant. 4:14), (b) political powers (Josh. 11:10; Isa. 7:8-9; 1 Ch. 7:40), and (c) human emotions (Ps. 137:6). From the sense of "value" has developed the meaning "sum, amount" (Lev. 5:24[6:5]; Nu. 1:49; 4:22; 31:49; Ps. 119:160; 139:17); *nāśāʾ rōʾš* means "sum up" (Ex. 30:12; Nu. 1:2; 4:2; 26:2; 31:26).[57]

VII. Anthropology and Theology.

1. *Literal Usage.* To the extent that the theological meaning of a noun depends on whether and how it is used in connection with God, there is little to say about the literal usage of *rōʾš* in the OT, in contrast to such other anthropological terms as → פנים *pānîm,* "face"; → עין *ʿayin,* "eye"; *ʾōzen,* "ear"; → פה *peh,* "mouth"; and *ʾappayim,* "nose"; and also in contrast to other religions, in which the head of the deity is endowed with numerous attributes (aureole, halo, crown, horns) or the deity is depicted with several heads (Phoenician idols) or even with an animal head (Egypt). Only in the concluding vision of the Aramaic section of Daniel does the text speak of the "hair of the head" of an "Ancient One" (Dnl. 7:9); in the interpretation (v. 22), the interest focuses not on this physical feature of the heavenly being (the "Ancient One" is not actually interpreted, but is simply understood as the eternal, immutable God of heaven) but on the figure's function of giving judgment for the holy ones of the Most High.[58] Later apocalyptic literature, drawing on this image, calls the "Ancient One" also the "Head of Days" (1 En. 46:1; 60:2; 71:20).[59] Although the image of white head and hair as a symbol of judicial authority recurs in Rev. 1:14 (here characterizing the Son of Man), there is no evidence for its use in the intertestamental period.

2. *Figurative Usage.* Used figuratively, *rōʾš* denotes God's position as ruler of the universe (1 Ch. 29:11), as commander of Israel's armies (2 Ch. 13:12), and as the royal leader of those returning from exile (Mic. 2:13). But this theological function of the word is also marginal.

---

54. W. Rudolph, *Klagelieder. KAT* XVII/1-3 (1962), 226.
55. Leene, 14.
56. See, respectively, Müller, 708; B. Gemser, *Sprüche Salomos. HAT* XVI (^{2}1963), 46.
57. Speiser.
58. J.-C. Lebram, *ZBK* 23, 85-92.
59. S. Uhlig, *Das äthiopische Henochbuch. JSHRZ* V/6, 586, 605, 633.

3. *Anthropological Usage.* The primary theological significance of *rōʾš* lies in its anthropological function.[60] The head is the preeminent part of the body, containing the organs of sight, hearing, taste, and smell; it is the locus of thought (albeit the heart also plays a role). From time immemorial it has been valued as the central place where the vital principle is crystallized. It is therefore surrounded by numerous rituals to preserve the requisites of life and seal fundamental human experiences. This is also true in Israel; this anthropological given finds expression in the language of the OT. For example, Achish says to David: "I will make you protector of my head [*šōmēr lᵉrōʾšî*, NRSV 'bodyguard']" (1 S. 28:2; cf. Ps. 140:8[7]). The vital significance of the head also lies behind treating the heads of enemies as trophies (Gen. 3:15; 40:19; Dt. 32:42; Jgs. 7:25; 1 S. 5:4; 17:54,57; 31:9; 2 S. 4:7,12; 20:21-22; 2 K. 10:7-8; Ps. 66:12; 2 Mc. 15:30; Jdt. 13:10). The following theological views are grounded in this anthropology:

a. The head suffers when God admonishes and judges (Dt. 32:42; Jgs. 9:53-56; 1 S. 17:46; 2 S. 4:7-8; 1 K. 2:32; Isa. 1:5-6; 7:20; 29:10; Jer. 23:19; Ezk. 16:43; Am. 8:10; 9:1; Jon. 4:8; Ps. 38:5[4]; 66:12; Job 19:9; Lam. 5:16). Conversely, the head benefits when God bestows reconciliation and salvation, blessing and election (Gen. 49:26; Lev. 14:18; 1 S. 10:1; 2 K. 9:6; Ezk. 16:12; Jon. 2:6[5]; 4:6; Zec. 3:5; 6:11; Ps. 3:4[3]; 21:4[3]; 23:5; 133:2; 140:8[7]; Job 29:3; Prov. 10:6; Eccl. 9:8).

b. The enemy's head is a target when Israel or the faithful believer receives God's help (Jer. 48:37-38; Hab. 3:14; Ps. 68:22[21]; 110:6).

c. The head can be used in a gesture to communicate something related to God: arrogance (Job 20:6), remorse (Josh. 7:6; Job 1:20; Ezr. 9:3), consecration (Lev. 21:10; Nu. 6:5; Jgs. 13:5; 16:17; 1 S. 1:11), a prayer for blessing (Gen. 48:14).

d. In the Semitic view people bear moral responsibility "on their heads"; therefore they find themselves constantly confronted with the God of Israel, who guarantees the ontological correlation of actions and consequences, thus ensuring justice as the principle ordering the world (Lev. 24:14; Nu. 5:7; Jgs. 9:57; 1 S. 25:39; 2 S. 1:16; 1 K. 2:33,44; 8:32; Ezk. 9:10; 11:21; 17:19; 22:31; Ob. 15; Neh. 3:36[4:4]).

4. *Spatial and Temporal Usage.* The word *rōʾš* also takes on theological significance in its spatial and temporal functions:[61]

a. The top *(rōʾš)* of a hill or mountain is a favorite place for Yahweh to reveal himself, hear prayers, make known his will, and receive worship (Ex. 17:9-10; 19:20; 24:17; Dt. 34:1; Jgs. 6:26; 2 S. 15:32; 1 K. 18:42). There too worshipers of idols practice their abominations (Hos. 4:13). A noise in the treetops indicates Yahweh's presence (2 S. 5:24); the Lord goes at the head of a group of people (Mic. 2:13; 2 Ch. 13:12); from the top of a ladder that reaches heaven, the angels of God ascend and descend (Gen. 28:12, in contrast to 11:4); Wisdom speaks "at the terminus of the city walls [or 'upon the walls'; or 'high above the noisy squares']" (Prov. 1:21).[62]

---

60. See III and IV.1 above.
61. See VI above.
62. O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos. BK* XVII (1984), 12-13.

b. In temporal usage *rō'š* qualifies theologically significant points in time such as the first month (Ex. 12:2), the first singing of praise (1 Ch. 16:7), and creation (Prov. 8:23; Eccl. 3:11). In Deutero-Isaiah the word takes on particular theological significance in the expression *mērō'š* (Isa. 40:21; 41:4,26; 42:11; 48:16). Although the semantic content of this expression is closely associated with other temporal expressions, some of which belong to the next lemma,[63] we note here its relative importance.[64] Although in each text where it occurs it denotes the distant past, the particular point in time differs in each case, depending on the retrospective moment at which something new or yet to come is proclaimed in extended perspective in contrast to what has gone before: in 40:21 the beginning of a long history, extending back to creation, during which Israel came to know Yahweh's sovereignty; in 41:4 the beginning of humankind; in 41:26 previous acts of God on behalf of Israel, which serve as prophecies of Cyrus's appearance; in 48:16 the earlier prophecy of Cyrus together with the present victory over Babylon.[65] In these texts Deutero-Isaiah has explicated the theological principle that every new experience of Yahweh's power and salvific will joins a history extending back to Israel's earliest memories.

Beuken

VIII. 1. *LXX.* The LXX recognized the semantic breadth of *rō'š* and documented it through differentiated translations. The usual equivalent is *kephalḗ* (291 times), denoting the head as part of the body; it can also stand for *gulgōleṯ* and (once) for *nep̱eš* (Isa. 43:4). Aquila uses *kephalḗ* consistently for *rō'š*, including *rō'š* II, "poison."[66] The second most frequent translation of *rō'š* is *árchōn* (104 times). The use of *archḗ* (55 times) and *archēgós* (15 times) is also common; less frequent is the use of *prṓtos* (9 times). There are 36 occurrences of *koryphḗ*. The spatial use of *rō'š* is reflected in *ákros* (16 times).

2. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* There are some 130 occurrences of the word in the Dead Sea Scrolls. All possible orthographic variants appear *(r'š, rw'š, r'wš, rwš, rš)*, but their distribution does not permit any literary conclusions. It is noteworthy that *rō'š* does not appear at all in 1QH and CD (although the latter does use → ראשׁ *rō'š* II, "poison"). There is a concentration of occurrences in 11QT (19), 1QM (28, plus 6 in the 4QM parallels), and 4Q400-407 (ShirShabb) (40). The fragmentary state of many texts precludes defining the semantic spectrum precisely.

a. *Verbal Idioms.* Verbal expressions are quite rare. Someone who does (material) damage to the community must make personal compensation (*šlm* piel *bᵉrôšô*, 1QS 7:6-7). In a blessing formula Yahweh places the crown on the head of the high priest (*nś' b*, 1QSb 3:3). In 4Q318 fr. 31, 4-9 (a lament?[67]) the psalmist says: "They have

---

63. → ראשׁון *ri'šôn;* → ראשׁית *rē'šîṯ.*
64. For a discussion of the entire subject see Leene, 14.
65. For a discussion of the individual passages see also J. L. Koole, *Jesaja* II/1. *COT.*
66. G. Bertram, *TDNT* III, 674 n. 2.
67. E. M. Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran. HSS* 28 (1986), 145.

plaited *(śrg)* a crown for my head" (l. 7). Yahweh carries out justice on the head of the wicked (*šwb* hiphil *b,* 1QM 11:14).

b. *Human Body.* The *rōʾš* also appears as a part of the human body in 1QSb 4:3 (a priestly blessing), 1QM 6:15 (helmet armor for cavalry divisions) and 7:11 (garments of war for the priests, which are not to be brought into the sanctuary), as well as 11QT 63:12 (cf. Dt. 21:12).

c. *Animals.* The head of a (sacrificial) animal is mentioned only in the Temple Scroll: in connection with the sacrifices on the festival of dedication (16:1,12), the sacrifices prescribed for the Day of Atonement (26:11,12; cf. Lev. 16:21), and the area where animals are slaughtered in the temple precincts (34:6; no biblical parallel). In contrast to Dt. 21:6, in the *ʿeglâ* ritual the elders of the city explicitly wash their hands over the head of the heifer (*ʿl rʾwš hʿglh,* 63:5).

d. *Leader.* The most common use of *rōʾš* is in the sense of "chief, leader." On the level of tribe and clan, the texts speak of *rʾšy ʾlpy yśrʾl* (1QSa 1:14; 2:14; 11QT 19:16), *rʾšy šbṭy yśrʾl* (4QpIs^{d} 1:7), *rʾšy byt yʿqwb* (3Q5 fr. 3, 3), and *ršym wśrym* (4QpPs37 3:5). In addition, the War Scroll speaks of the heads of the four camps, each of which accommodates three tribes (1QM 3:14).

Transitional figures are the "heads of the tribes and families of the community" (*rʾšy hšbṭym wʾbwt hʿdh,* 1QM 2:3; 4QM^{d} 2, 6).

In the hierarchy of the Qumran community, the texts speak frequently of the "family heads of the community" (*rʾšy ʾbwt hʿdh,* 1QSa 1:16,23-24,25; 2:16; 1QM 2:7; 3:4). In 1QSa, as above, the expression probably refers to administrative rather than cultic duties.[68] We also find *rʾšy ʾbwt llwyym* (1Q22 fr. 1, 3) and *rʾšy bty hʾbwt lbny yśrʾl* (11QT 42:14).

Other usages include the twelve heads of the priests and Levites (1QM 2:1,2) and "chiefs of the divisions" (*rʾšy [h]mšmrwt:* 1QM 2:2,3,4) associated with them and the family heads.

e. *Kingship.* Only once is *rōʾš* associated with kingship. Whoever is appointed king (*mlk* hiphil) becomes the head (*ʾt rʾwš*) of the Israelites (11QT 57:2, an addition to the Dtn law of the king).

f. *Military Contexts.* Apart from the letter Mur 42:2 *(rwš hmḥnyh),* only the War Scroll uses *rōʾš* in military contexts; here it denotes the leaders of the divisions and formations (1QM 15:4; 16:4,5; 17:10; 18:6; 19:12 par. 4QM^{b} 11.2, 11); in 1QM 9:11 it denotes a segment of a specific military formation.

g. *High Priest.* The *kôhēn hārôʾš,* the chief priestly functionary, is mentioned 8 times. He addresses the troops before battle (1QM 8:6; 16:4,5; 17:10; 18:6; 19:12 par. 4QM^{a} 11.2, 11) and recites the prayer of thanksgiving after victory is achieved (1QM 18:5; 19:11?). Finally, 4Q401 fr. 13, 3 speaks of a "third *(hšlyšy)* among the high priests *(bkwhny rwš).*"

h. *Heavenly Beings.* In the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice (4Q400-407), the hierar-

68. H. Muszyński, *Fundament, Bild und Metapher in den Handschriften aus Qumran. AnBibl* 61 (1975), 204.

chical structure of the heavenly beings is expressed in part by titles containing the element *r'š*.[69] It appears as *nomen rectum* only in the phrase *nśy'y rwš* (4Q403 fr. 1, 1:10,17,21,23; 4Q404 2:2,5; 4Q405 fr. 3, 1:12a; 2:6); in the other titles (11 in all), it is *nomen regens: r'šy dbyrw* (403 fr. 1, 2:11), *r'šy lbwšy pl'* (405 fr. 23, 2:10), *r'šy mmlkwt* (403 fr. 1, 2:3), *r'šy mmšlwt* (401 fr. 14, 1:6; cf. 4Q511 fr. 2, 1:3), *r'šy mrwmym* (403 fr. 1, 1:34; 405 frs. 4-5, 2; 405 fr. 6, 4), *r'šy nśy'ym* (403 fr. 1, 2:20) and *r'šy nśy'y kwhnwt* (403 fr. 1, 2:21; 405 frs. 8-9, 5), *r'šy 'dt hmlk* (403 fr. 1, 2:24), *r'šy tbnyt 'lwhym* (403 fr. 1, 2:16), *r'šy trwmwt* (405 fr. 23, 2:12), and *r'šy twšbḥwt* (403 fr. 1, 1:31). The use of *rō'š* with reference to angels or heavenly beings is otherwise unknown in the OT and the Dead Sea Scrolls.

A special significance attaches to the number seven: seven deputies *(nśy'y mšnh)* are associated with the seven *nśy'y rwš* mentioned in the first and especially the sixth and eighth Songs. As in the case of *r'šy nśy'ym* and *r'šy nśy'y kwhnwt,* Newsom sees in these titles a certain dependence on texts in Numbers, albeit in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice the angelic beings — unlike the titled figures in Numbers — perform priestly functions (e.g., blessing in the name of God).[70]

Finally, the *r'šy lbwšy pl'* wear high priestly garments. Taken as a whole, this evidence suggests that in the *r'šym* (and *nśy'ym*) we are dealing with "angelic high priests."[71]

i. *Spatial Usage.* In spatial usage *rō'š* denotes the head of a group in 1QS 6:14; 1QSb 4:23; 1QM 3:13 par. 4QM^{f} 10:3; 11QT 57:4; 62:5. The "highest heaven" and the "greatest height" are mentioned in 4Q403 fr. 1, 1:43; 2:10. Intricately decorated lance heads and sword blades are the subject of 1QM 5:11,12.

j. *Temporal Usage.* Used temporally, *rō'š* in combination with *ḥwdš* denotes the first day of the month or the new moon (4Q503 fr. 32, 2; 512 frs. 33+35, 3; 11QT 11:9; 14:2,7,9; 11QPs^{a} 27:7), as well as the first days of the year or the seasons (1QS 10:4-5,6,8). The emphasis is not so much on a chronological beginning as on the "primary and fundamental role played by these days in determining the cultic calendar." The fundamental importance of these days is underlined by "the coincidence of the quarterly cycle with the basic cosmic constitution of time."[72]

k. *Excellence.* Two passages, finally, use *rō'š* as a term for excellence (4Q403 fr. 1, 1:40; 2:34).[73]

Dahmen

---

69. Initially noted by J. Strugnell, *SVT* 7 (1960), 334; for a full discussion see C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice. HSS* 27 (1985), 23-38, esp. 27.

70. Newsom, *Songs,* 32-33.

71. *Ibid.,* 33.

72. Muszyński, *Fundament,* 147.

73. Newsom, *Songs,* 220, 245.

ראשׁ II *rōʾš* II

I. Etymology and Occurrences. II. LXX. III. Meaning: 1. Poisonous Plant; 2. Poison; 3. Venom; 4. Bitterness. IV. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Etymology and Occurrences. None of the Semitic languages gives any help with respect to the etymology of the noun *rōʾš* II, since the word occurs only in Hebrew. For its semantic analysis, therefore, we must rely solely on its 12 OT occurrences, distributed over the books of Deuteronomy (3), Jeremiah (3), Hosea (1), Amos (1), Psalms (1), Job (1), and Lamentations (2). Of these, Dt. 29:17(Eng. 18); Jer. 9:14(15); 23:15; Am. 6:12; and Lam. 3:19 are notable for the parallel use of → לענה *laʿᵃnâ* (some kind of poison or poisonous plant).[1] We also find the construct phrases *mê rōʾš* (3 times in Jeremiah) and *rōʾš pᵉṯānîm* (Dt. 32:33; Job 20:16).

II. LXX. The normal LXX translation is *cholḗ*. McKane is probably correct in assuming that this translation refers not so much to gall itself, the secretion of the gall bladder, as to its associated bitterness.[2] This theory is supported by the use of *pikría* to translate *rōʾš* in Am. 6:12.

III. Meaning. In the rabbinic commentaries as well as in the Jeremiah commentaries of the 18th century, interpretations fluctuate between "poisonous herb" and "venom."[3] For both interpretations we also find attempts to establish a relationship with → ראשׁ *rōʾš* I, "head": the "head" of a poppy[4] or serpent[5] produces poison. The chronology of the texts suggests that *rōʾš* refers primarily to a kind of plant that cannot be identified botanically. Suggestions have included not only the opium poppy but also the wild colocynth *(Citrullus colocynthis)*,[6] used as a purgative, and the deadly spotted hemlock *(Conium maculatum)*, which contains coniine.[7] Zohary disputes this last identification, arguing that it is "linguistically untenable, although it is established in Modern Hebrew."[8]

---

rōʾš II. W. McKane, "Poison, Trial by Ordeal, and the Cup of Wrath," *VT* 30 (1980) 474-92; H. N. and A. L. Moldenke, *Plants of the Bible* (1952), esp. 78ff.; M. Zohary, *Plants of the Bible* (Eng. trans. London, 1982), esp. 186.

1. See K. Seybold, → VIII, 14-16.
2. McKane, 479.
3. *Ibid.,* 480.
4. *GesTh,* 1251.
5. H. Venema, *Commentarius ad Librum Prophetiarum Jeremiae* (1765), 236-37.
6. O. Schrader, *Kulturpflanzen und Hausthiere in ihrem Übergang aus Asien* (⁷Berlin, 1902); cf. Moldenke.
7. See already Venema, 583.
8. Zohary, 186.

1. *Poisonous Plant.* The meaning of *rōʾš* is exhibited most clearly in Hos. 10:4. The simile in this text obviously refers to a wild plant, which grows luxuriantly but is deadly poison. The simile in v. 4b summarizes v. 4a *(waw explicativum),* including the element of constant repetition implicit in the first stich, while at the same time unmasking what superficially appears to be justice (fine words, oaths, covenants) as actual injustice detrimental to those affected. The botanical realm is also suggested by Dt. 29:17b(18b), a redactional addition to v. 17a(18a),[9] although the question remains open whether the word refers to the poisonous plant sprouting from the root or to the poison within it.[10] The image of the root bringing forth poison alludes to the hidden danger represented by the presence of apostates from Yahweh in the midst of God's people. The appearance of *laʿănâ* in parallel with *rōʾš* in Am. 6:12 and Lam. 3:19 (as in Dt. 29:17[18]) also suggests the notion of a poisonous plant or a botanical poison. According to Lam. 3:19, thinking of an uprooted life affects the poet like ingesting poison, being physically as well as psychically injurious. In the Amos passage the notion of a plant or a botanical substance is also insinuated by the term → פרי *pᵉrî:* the fruit of righteousness, i.e., the benefit that should accrue to those who do justice, does not emerge. The contrary is true *(hāpaḵ):* innocence is no protection against condemnation (cf. Am. 2:6b; 5:12).

It is possible that Ps. 69:22(21) also refers to a plant that is dangerous or at least unpleasant to consume: its fruit is given to the distressed psalmist along with vinegar. The parallel with *ḥōmēṣ* is more suggestive of bitterness (cf. Dt. 32:32 in parallel with *mārar*) than of poison, although the two aspects are not mutually exclusive.

2. *Poison.* The noun takes on a more general meaning as *nomen rectum* in the construct phrases *mê rōʾš* and *ʿinnᵉḇê rôš* (the orthographic variant appears also in the fragmentary text 4Q511 71:3); here it qualifies a substance or fruit as poisonous, although the phrase *mê rōʾš* does not necessarily imply that the poison of the *rōʾš* plant is dissolved in the water. This poisoned water appears in Jer. 8:14 (Jeremiah) by itself and in 23:15 (Jeremiah) and 9:14(15) (Dtr/Dtn editor of Jeremiah) in conjunction with *laʿănâ;* it represents metaphorically God's sanction against the false prophets and the sinful people. The phrase *mê rōʾš* is thus a motif of judgment; as such it is distinct from the ordeal in which the accused drinks the "water of bitterness" (Nu. 5:11-28). It is misleading to unite the two motifs by suggesting that the poisoned water in Jeremiah would have no effect if the people or prophets were innocent, so that its deadly effect is "a demonstration of guilt."[11] The three Jeremiah texts are therefore related not to Nu. 5 but to Ex. 32:20(21), where the water mixed with the dust of the broken tablets serves as a form of sanction.[12]

---

9. D. Knapp, *Deuteronomium 4. GTA* 35 (1987), 148.

10. See Seybold, → VIII, 15.

11. McKane, 486.

12. C. Dohmen, *Das Bilderverbot. BBB* 62 (²1987), 131; contra R. Press, *ZAW* 51 (1933) 125ff., who finds Jer. 8:14 and Ex. 32 connected by the motif of an ordeal by drinking.

In Dt. 32:32 the image of poisonous grapes characterizes the enemies of Israel: it is they who are the real cause of Yahweh's judgment upon Israel.

3. *Venom.* Dt. 32:33 equates the wine produced by these poisonous grapes (albeit with the third person masc. sg. pronominal suf.) with the venom of serpents. Once *rō'š* has lost its specific reference to a botanical poison in favor of the more general meaning "poison," it can serve (as *nomen regens*) to denote the venom of serpents. In addition to Dt. 32:33, Job 20:16 refers to this deadly poison.[13]

4. *Bitterness.* In Lam. 3:5 *tᵉlā'â,* "tribulation," suggests that *rō'š* should be understood figuratively in the sense of "bitterness."[14] At the same time, however, it implies the aspect of death, developed explicitly in the following verse.

IV. Dead Sea Scrolls. The noun does not appear frequently in the Dead Sea Scrolls. In 1QH 4:14 the schemes of Belial are compared to a root that produces "poison and wormwood" *(rôš wᵉla'ᵃnâ).* Dt. 32:33 is quoted by CD 8:10-11 and 19:22-23, comparing the temptations of the enemy to the venom of serpents and asps. Among the other texts, only the fragmentary 4Q511 71:3 raises the possibility of translating *rôš* (!) as "poison"; but the translation "head" is also possible.[15]

Fleischer

13. On moving this verse to a position following v. 14, see G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (²1989), 325.
14. See III.1 above; H.-J. Kraus, *BK* XX³, 52.
15. *DJD,* VII, 251.

ראשׁוֹן *ri'šôn*

I. Word, Lexical Field, LXX. II. Secular Usage. III. Theological Usage: 1. Deutero-Isaiah; 2. Other.

ri'šôn. A. Bentzen, "On the Ideas of 'the Old' and 'the New' in Deutero-Isaiah," *ST* 1 (1948) 183-87; J. Blau, "Some Ugaritic, Hebrew, and Arabic Parallels," *JNSL* 10 (1982) 5-10; M. Haran, *Between Ri'shonôt (Former Prophecies) and Ḥadashôt (New Prophecies)* [Heb.] (Jerusalem, 1963); É.-M. Laperrousaz, "Les 'ordonnances premières' et les 'ordonnances dernières' dans les manuscrits de la mer morte," *FS A. Dupont-Sommer* (Paris, 1971), 405-19; H. Leene, *De vroegere en de nieuwe dingen bij Deuterojesaja* (1987), with bibliog.; S. E. Loewenstamm, "The Development of the Term 'First' in the Semitic Languages" (Heb.), *Tarbiz* 24 (1955) 249-51 = *Comparative Studies in Biblical and Ancient Oriental Literatures. AOAT* 24 (1980), 13-16; H.-P.

I. Word, Lexical Field, LXX. The adj. *ri'šôn* occurs 182 times in the OT, 3 times in Sirach (31[34]:18; 41:3; 46:3), twice in the Arad inscriptions (1:6; 5:4),[1] and frequently in the Dead Sea Scrolls (only in Job 8:8 and 11QT do we find the variant *rîšôn;* the form *ri'šōnîṯ* occurs only in Jer. 25:1). It is connected etymologically with → ראש *rō'š* and corresponds to Akk. *rēštû(m).*[2] It appears most commonly as a masculine singular or plural or as a feminine singular; the feminine plural appears only in Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah (41:22; 42:9; 43:9,18; 46:9; 48:3; 65:17b [reactualizing and expanding 43:18-19[3]]). Usage in the Dead Sea Scrolls does not differ materially from that in the OT; these occurrences are therefore incorporated into the following discussion rather than being treated separately.

The distribution of occurrences[4] is unremarkable (none in Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Malachi, Song of Songs, and Lamentations); the only unusual phenomenon is the theological usage of the word in Deutero-Isaiah and other postexilic texts.[5]

There is no certain occurrence of the word in Ugaritic, nor does it appear elsewhere in Israel's immediate Near Eastern environment.[6] The appearance of the word is uncertain in Isa. 41:27 and in several of the Dead Sea Scrolls (1Q30 5, 2; 4Q400 2, 10; 4Q402 4, 13; 11QShirShab 1:3-4; 11QT 14:9).

Because of its complex range of meanings and usages,[7] *ri'šôn* is embedded in a copious lexical field, including above all אחרית/אחרון *'aḥ^arôn/'aḥ^arîṯ;* אתה/בוא *bô'/ 'āṯâ;*[8] → זכר *zāḵar;*[9] חדש *ḥdš;*[10] קדם *qdm* and its derivatives; in lists, etc., also שנית *šēnîṯ;* cf. also נגד *ngd.*[11]

In the LXX the commonest translation of *ri'šôn* is *prṓtos; próteros* is used 13 times (plus Sir. 31[34]:18; 46:3), and *tó próteron* and *émprosthe(n)* 9 each. Other occasional translations include *archaíos* (Ps. 79[78]:8; 89[88]:49), *archḗ* (Gen. 13:4), *enárchesthai* (Nu. 9:5), *patḗr* (Dt. 19:14), *presbýteros* (2 Ch. 22:1); *prṓēn* (Josh. 8:5), and *prṓton* (Josh. 8:33; also Sir. 31[34]:17?), illustrating the interpretive, contextual approach of the LXX translators.

Müller, "ראש *rōš* Kopf," *THAT,* II, 701-15, esp. 703, 711-12; C. R. North, "The 'Former Things' and the 'New Things' in Deutero-Isaiah," *FS T. H. Robinson* (New York, 1950), 111-26; D. H. Odendaal, "The 'Former and the New Things' in Isaiah 40–48," *OTWSA* 10 (1967) 64-75; H. D. Preuss, *Deuterojesaja* (1976), esp. 47-49; A. Schoors, "Les choses antérieures et les choses nouvelles dans les oracles deutéro-isaïens," *ETL* 40 (1964) 19-47; C. Stuhlmueller, "'First and Last' and 'Yahweh-Creator' in Deutero-Isaiah," *CBQ* 29 (1967) 495-511.

1. Y. Aharoni, *Arad Inscriptions* (Jerusalem, 1975), 12-13, 21, 162.
2. *AHw,* II, 973.
3. E. Sehmsdorf, *ZAW* 84 (1972) 520-21.
4. Müller, 703.
5. See III below.
6. Cf. the negative entries in *KAI, DISO,* and Beyer.
7. See II and III below.
8. → II, 34.
9. → IV, 67-69.
10. → IV, 240-41.
11. → IX, 181-82.

II. Secular Usage. The adj. *ri'šôn* occurs frequently in dates (the first day [*yôm*],[12] the first month [*ḥōḏeš*],[13] the first year), especially in regulations governing the cultic calendar (Gen. 8:13; Ex. 12:2,15[twice],16,18; 40:2,17; Lev. 23:5,7,35,39,40; Nu. 7:12; 9:1,5; 20:1; 28:16,18; 33:3[twice]; Dt. 16:4; Josh. 4:19; 2 S. 21:9; Ezk. 29:17; 30:20; 45:18,21; Est. 3:7,12; Dnl. 10:4; Ezr. 6:19; 8:31; 10:17; Neh. 8:18; 1 Ch. 12:16[Eng. 15]; 27:2,3; 2 Ch. 29:3[twice],17[twice]; 35:1; cf. also Jer. 25:1 [*ri'šōnîṯ*]; 1QS 7:19; 4Q400 1, 1:1[twice]; 11QT 14:9; 17:6; 28:3; 49:17; 50:14; 11QMelch 2:7).

We also find *ri'šôn* (often fem. or masc. pl.) with the meaning "before." This usage is frequent in sequences of events, where it indicates temporal priority (Gen. 13:4; 25:25; 28:19; 32:18[17]; 38:28; 40:13; 41:20; Ex. 4:8; 34:1[twice]; 34:4; Lev. 4:21; 5:8; 9:15; Nu. 6:12; 10:13,14; 21:26; Dt. 9:18; 10:1,2,3,4,10; 13:10[9]; 17:7; 24:4; Josh. 8:5,6,33; 21:10; Jgs. 18:29; 20:22,32,39; 1 S. 14:14; 17:30; 2 S. 18:27; 19:21,44[20,43]; 20:18; 1 K. 13:6; 17:13; 18:25; 20:9,17; 2 K. 1:14; Jer. 36:28[twice]; 50:17; Ezk. 40:21; Joel 2:23; Zec. 6:2; 12:7; 14:10; Job 15:7; Prov. 18:17; 20:21; Ruth 3:10; Est. 1:14; Dnl. 8:21; 10:12,13; 11:13,29; Ezr. 3:12; Neh. 5:15; 7:5; 1 Ch. 9:2; 11:6[twice]; 15:13; 17:9; 18:17; 24:7; 25:9; 27:2; 29:29; 2 Ch. 3:3; 9:29; 12:15; 16:11; 20:34; 25:26; 26:22; 28:26; cf. Sir. 31:17; 1QS 2:20; 6:5[twice, probably dittography]; 6:8; CD 5:19; 14:3,5; 4QFlor 1:5; 11QT 16:6,15; 45:4; 60:7; cf. 15:18; 21:4; 23:10-11). "First" with the nuance "above all" occurs in Isa. 60:9 (cf. Ezr. 9:2). In the Arad inscriptions (1:6; 5:4), it is uncertain whether the "first" flour *(qemaḥ)* means the "earliest" flour or "especially good" flour. In Neh. 7:5 the expression "the first to come back" clearly conveys positive overtones. A spatial sense of "in front" is found in Gen. 33:2 and Nu. 2:9 *(ri'šōnâ).*

One distinct group of texts comprises the statements about David, Solomon, Rehoboam, Jehoshaphat, etc., that refer to the acts of these kings "from first to last," recorded in other texts not incorporated into the books of Chronicles (1 Ch. 29:29; 2 Ch. 9:29; 12:15; 16:11; 20:34; 25:26; 26:22; 28:26; 35:27).

Finally, the "earlier ones" in various contexts are clearly ancestors or forebears (Dt. 19:14; cf. Lev. 26:45; Jer. 34:5; Ps. 79:8; Job 8:8; Eccl. 1:11 [cf. Sir. 41:3]; 2 Ch. 22:1).[14]

III. Theological Usage.

1. *Deutero-Isaiah.* Mostly beginning with the exile and Deutero-Isaiah (more specifically Isa. 40–48), we find a weightier theological use of *ri'šôn* (in its various forms), referring to the "former things" as being constitutive for the present and future or else being superseded. This usage of *ri'šôn* appears in Isa. 40–48 in textual units belonging to the genres of prophecy of salvation, disputation, and lawsuit (between Yahweh and the nations): 41:4,22; 42:9; 43:9,18; 44:6; 46:9,(10); 48:3,12.

At the outset, Yahweh is described as "the first" (41:4), before whom no God was

---

12. → VI, 22-25.
13. → IV, 225ff.
14. For a discussion of these texts, see III below.

formed (43:10,13); Yahweh is also and will be the last, forming and embracing everything (44:6; 48:12) and consequently the only true God, who alone governs history. The inability of other gods to proclaim what went before and is to come (41:22-23; 44:7; 45:7; the obscure text 41:27 should probably also be understood in this sense) reveals that they are not really gods (41:23). These texts clearly have to do with general sovereignty over history in word and deed, not specific events (cf. also 42:9; 44:6-8). Isa. 42:8-9 may be an addendum, although it can function well as the climax led up to by vv. 5-7; this may be the first recognition of Cyrus's victorious appearance, the "new things" (cf. 42:9; 48:6 [fem. pl.]; 43:19 [sg.]) being his ongoing effect. The Cyrus event is clearly central and liminal to the contrast between what has been and what is to come. The argument of 43:9 is similar to that of 45:21: let the other gods proclaim the former things — in other words, demonstrate to their peoples that what they predicted has come to pass (on *zō'ṯ* cf. 45:21, the present as an anticipatory contrast to the past). According to 44:6-8 (cf. 41:4; 43:10,13; 48:12; also Rev. 1:17; 2:8; 22:13), Yahweh's word, which brings itself to pass, demonstrates that he alone is God, a claim developed by Isa. 48:12-13 (cf. Ps. 33:9) from the perspective of creation. God's initial creative act is the foundation for his work in the present; it consoles by demonstrating the universality of God's sovereignty.[15] A linear sense of history can be clearly seen here. That Yahweh is a God whose prophecies are fulfilled, so that remembrance of these "former things" can and should strengthen faith, is also the burden of 46:8 (cf. 48:3).

Isa. 43:18 (within 43:16-21, a prophecy of salvation) has a unique place in this group of texts from Deutero-Isaiah.[16] This text commands Israel not (!) to remember the former things (cf. also 41:22; 42:9; 43:18; 48:3), since Yahweh is doing something new that is already springing forth.[17] The "former things" can hardly refer to the descent to Egypt (52:4) or to the first exodus (cf. the context), the judgment of 587, or the present exile of those addressed; now Yahweh is doing something that surpasses the entire past history of Israel, a new thing that is to be central to the life of Israel,[18] which cannot simply be subsumed in the categories of a "new exodus" (43:18ff.). Thus the former things are still at work in the new things and continue to unfold. They are not the total opposite of the new things but are superseded by them. It is the Cyrus event that constitutes the point where the former things of history, words and events, intersect with what is now taking place; all is held together by Yahweh and his sovereign word and act. It is also possible that the contrastive dyads so important for Isa. 40–55 (former/coming, etc.) play a significant role in revealing a network of semantic isotopies linking smaller textual units to form larger textual compositions.[19]

Similar in content to the texts from Deutero-Isaiah are 4Q402 4, 4:13 and 11QShirShab 1:3-4.

---

15. K. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja. BK* XI/1 (1989), 402, citing similar statements in the Gathas (1:38).

16. See C. Westermann, *Prophetische Heilsworte im AT. FRLANT* 145 (1987), 33-53.

17. → צמח *ṣmḥ.*

18. For a discussion of the problem see Elliger, *BK* XI/1, 350ff.; Leene, 148ff.

19. Leene.

2. *Other.* That something earlier was better is maintained by Isa. 1:26 (judges), Hos. 2:9(7) (a husband), Mic. 4:8 (dominion; but it will return to Zion), Hag. 2:3 (the temple; but cf. 2:9 and Ezr. 3:12); David is an example of someone earlier who was good (2 Ch. 17:3). The earlier is or will be superseded according to Isa. 8:23(9:1); Hag. 2:9 (the temple); 1 Ch. 15:13. Ecclesiastes, on the other hand, maintains that one should not think of former days (7:10), especially since the people of long ago are not remembered (1:11; cf. Job 8:8;[20] 15:7).

Other texts often stress that the Israelites' ancestors also sinned and transgressed in their time (Isa. 43:27; Zec. 1:4; Neh. 5:15; Ps. 79:8), so that earlier sin brought just punishment (Jer. 7:12; 11:10; cf. 2 K. 17:34,40; Isa. 65:7; primarily Dtr texts or exilic-postexilic comments). Zec. 8:11-12 insists that Yahweh will not deal with the remnant (*šᵉʼērîṯ*)[21] of his people as in the former days (cf. Jer. 33:7,11). According to Jer. 16:18, Yahweh will repay iniquity before bringing salvation; but according to 33:7 he will restore the fortunes of Judah and Israel and rebuild them "as they were at first."

All this questioning of the continued force of former promises of salvation (Lev. 26:45; Dt. 4:32; 2 S. 7:10, later noted in CD 5:19 and 4QFlor 1:5, then expressed explicitly in Ps. 89:50[49]) brings us (probably with Jer. 17:12 also) to the time of the exile and later (cf. Zec. 1:4; 7:7,12: "former prophets"); it becomes a major theme of Dtr literature and texts under Dtr influence, thus flanking and interpreting the fundamental reflections of Deutero-Isaiah.[22] Former troubles are later forgotten (Isa. 65:16), the ancient ruins shall be rebuilt by those who are now mourning (61:4). Indeed, Yahweh himself will create a new heaven and a new earth, so that the former things (fem. pl.) will not be remembered (65:17). Yahweh's way with his people goes on, his acts will continue to increase until they are fulfilled, as befits this God of promises, history, and future.

Preuss

---

20. See J. Khanjian, *RSP,* II, 398, IX.47.
21. → שׁאר *šʼr.*
22. See III.1 above.

רֵאשִׁית *rēʼšîṯ*

I. General. II. OT: 1. Beginning; 2. Firstfruits; 3. Best. III. Dead Sea Scrolls. IV. Sirach.

---

rēʼšîṯ. W. Eichrodt, "In the Beginning," *Israel's Prophetic Heritage. FS J. Muilenburg* (New York, 1962), 1-10; O. Eissfeldt, *Erstlinge und Zehnten im AT. BWANT* 22 (1917); J. de Fraine, "Prémices," *DBS,* VIII, 446-61; J. Milgrom, "First Fruits, Old Testament," *IDBSup* 336-37;

I. General. The noun *rēʾšîṯ* (cf. Akk. *rēšru[m]*[1]) is a derivative of → ראשׁ *rōʾš,* "head"; it is an abstract noun with the suf. *-îṯ.*[2] Its various meanings — "beginning," "best," "firstfruits" — are all extensions of the meaning "head, extremity": "beginning" is the temporal extreme, "best" the qualitative extreme; "firstfruits" combines both notions, since they are the earliest and/or the best part of the harvest. As synonyms we find *tᵉḥillâ,* "beginning"; *ḥēleḇ,* "fat, best portion"; and *bikkûrîm,* "firstfruits."

The noun *rēʾšîṯ* occurs 51 times in the OT: 3 in Genesis, twice each in Exodus and Leviticus, 4 in Numbers, 7 in Deuteronomy, twice in 1 Samuel, once in Isaiah, 6 in Jeremiah, 4 in Ezekiel, once each in Hosea and Micah, twice in Amos, 3 in Psalms, 5 in Proverbs, 3 in Job, once each in Ecclesiastes and Daniel, twice in Nehemiah, and once in 2 Chronicles. It is not limited to a particular source or period, although in P it does acquire the specialized technical meaning "first processed (of the harvest)."

The LXX uses a variety of terms to translate *rēʾšîṯ,* most often *archḗ,* "beginning," and *aparchḗ,* "firstfruits" (used also to translate *tᵉrûmâ* and *ḥēleḇ*). Other translations include *archēgós,* "beginning, origin"; *émprosthen,* "previously"; *kephálaion,* "head, chief"; *prṓimos,* "early"; *próteron,* "earlier"; *prṓta,* "first"; and *prōtogenḗmata,* "firstfruits." The verb *apérchesthai* translates "offer firstfruits."

II. OT.

1. *Beginning.* When it means "beginning," *rēʾšîṯ* is the opposite of *ʾaḥᵃrîṯ,* "end," in the sense of final situation. In this it differs from its synonym *tᵉḥillâ.* which stands in contrast only to subsequent situations. Thus *rēʾšîṯ* refers to the beginning of a process with a definite end or goal, or to a specific limited period of time, whereas *tᵉḥillâ* means simply the first in a series of events without a definite end. This difference is reflected in the following idioms: *mērēʾšîṯ haššānâ wᵉʿaḏ ʾaḥᵃrîṯ šānâ,* "from the beginning of the year to the end of the year" (Dt. 11:12); *ṭôḇ ʾaḥᵃrîṯ dāḇār mērēʾšîṯô,* "better is the end [i.e., the final form] of something than its beginning" (Eccl. 7:8); *bᵉrēʾšîṯ mamleḵeṯ yᵉhôyāqim,* "at the beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim" (Jer. 27:1; cf. 26:1; 28:1; 49:34; reigns always have a beginning and an end); *ʾᵃšer-hāyâ šām ʾohºlōh battᵉḥillâ,* "where his tent had been at the beginning/originally" (Gen. 13:3); *mî yaʿᵃleh . . . ʾel-hakkᵉnaʿᵃnî battᵉḥillâ,* "Who shall go up first for us against the Canaanites?" (Jgs. 1:1; the question implies that other battles will follow). The proverb *rēʾšîṯ ḥoḵmâ yirʾaṯ yhwh* (Ps. 111:10; cf. Prov. 1:7) may be compared to its counterpart *tᵉḥillaṯ ḥoḵmâ yirʾaṯ yhwh* (Prov. 9:10). The former seems to imply a perfect state of wisdom, which one should seek to achieve; the latter envisions only the subsequent (and possi-

---

idem, "Studies in the Temple Scroll," *JBL* 97 (1978) 501-23, esp. 504-6; H.-P. Müller, "ראשׁ *rōš* Kopf," *THAT,* II, 701-15, esp. 702, 703-11; N. H. Ridderbos, "Genesis I 1 und 2," *OTS* 12 (1958) 214-60, esp. 216-19; G. Rinaldi, "*bᵉreʾšit* Gn 1,1," *BiOr* 25 (1983) 144; J. de Savignac, "Note sur le sens du verset VIII 22 des Proverbes," *VT* 4 (1954) 429-32; W. Wifall, "God's Accession Year According to P," *Bibl* 62 (1981) 527-34.

1. *AHw,* II, 972-73.
2. *GK,* §86l.

bly never-ending) process of acquiring wisdom. Possibly the former should be understood as meaning: "The best part of wisdom is the fear of Yahweh."

Usually *rē'šîṯ* appears in the construct, denoting the beginning *of* something. It is normally followed by a noun or pronoun, but in Gen. 1:1 by a finite verb. Therefore we should follow Rashi in understanding Gen. 1:1 to mean: "When God began to create heaven and earth — the earth was a formless void — God said, 'Let there be light.'" It is not necessary to emend *bārā'* (third masc. sg.) to *bᵉrō'* (inf. const.), since the same construction (const. noun followed by finite verb) occurs also in Hos. 1:2: "When Yahweh began to speak through Hosea *(tᵉḥillaṯ dibber-yhwh bᵉhôšēa')*, he said to Hosea. . . ." Such an interpretation of Gen. 1:1 is further supported by the absence of the article: if the author had wished to say, "In the beginning, God created . . . ," we would find *bēr'šîṯ* instead of *bᵉrē'šîṯ*. Here, therefore, *rē'šîṯ* does not allude to an absolute beginning of time or the universe, but simply to the beginning of the process by which God created the world, a process that ended on the sixth day.

The expression *rē'šîṯ 'ôn*, "beginning of someone's fertility or virility" (Gen. 49:3; Dt. 21:17; Ps. 78:51; 105:36), means the firstborn of a father, in contrast to *peṭer reḥem*, "that which opens the womb," the firstborn of a mother. Dt. 21:7 gives precedence to the firstborn son in matters of inheritance, just because he is "the beginning of his [the father's] virility," i.e., the first, foremost, and best son, and therefore the worthiest, even if he is not the son of the father's favorite wife.

2. *Firstfruits*. In P *rē'šîṯ* denotes the first-processed part of the harvest, *bikkûrîm* the first-ripe part of the harvest.[3] The *bikkûrîm* means an offering of the first sheaves of grain, whereas *rē'šîṯ* means an offering of processed produce: grain (already threshed and winnowed), oil (already pressed), new wine (already vinified), fruit syrup, and dough. The difference is illustrated by Nu. 18:12-13: "the best *(ḥēleḇ)* of all the oil, the best *(ḥēleḇ)* of all the wine and grain, their first-processed *(rē'šîṯ)* that they give to the Lord, I have given to you. The firstfruits *(bikkûrîm)* of all that is in their land, which they bring to the Lord, shall be yours." In Lev. 2:12 *qorban rē'šîṯ* means "offering of the first-processed products," bread and syrup (v. 11). Nu. 15:20-21 prescribes the offering of first-processed breadstuffs. However, the expression *'ōmer rē'šîṯ qᵉṣîrᵉḵem* (Lev. 23:10) does not use *rē'šîṯ* in the technical sense of "first-processed" but in the temporal sense. It refers to "the sheaf of the beginning of your harvest." The same is true in the case of *rē'šîṯ bikkûrê 'aḏmāṯᵉḵē*, "the first of the firstfruits of your ground" (Ex. 23:19; 34:26), which refers to the same offerings; but the phrase could also mean "the best of the firstfruits of your ground."

Since *bikkûrîm* does not occur in Deuteronomy, in that book we cannot make a sharp distinction between "first-ripe" and "first-processed." Deuteronomy probably uses *rē'šîṯ* for firstfruits of all kinds, both the "first-processed" (Dt. 18:4: grain, wine, oil, fleece) and "firstfruits" in general (Dt. 26:2,10: *rē'šîṯ pᵉrî hā'ᵃḏāmâ*). This nontechnical use of the term is probably primary also in Jer. 2:3; Ezk. 20:40; 48:14; Prov. 3:9;

3. Milgrom, "First Fruits."

Neh. 10:38[37]; 12:44; 2 Ch. 31:5). It is often hard to decide whether *rē'šîṯ* means "the firstfruits" or simply "the best." In non-Priestly texts we should probably not make a sharp distinction between these two meanings.

The "first/best fruits" were offered to honor God and to obtain God's blessing for the rest of the harvest: "Honor the Lord with your substance, with the best/first *(rē'šîṯ)* of all your produce; then your barns will be filled with plenty, and your vats will be bursting with wine" (Prov. 3:9-10). The new harvest could not be used for food until the first sheaf had been offered (Lev. 23:14). The sons of Eli were cursed because they did not first make an offering to God but were accustomed to taking their portion of the offering "even before the fat [*ḥēleḇ;* God's portion of the offering] was burned" (1 S. 2:15). In 1 S. 2:29 they are denounced for fattening themselves on the best part *(rē'šîṯ)* of all Israel's offerings.

3. *Best.* In Am. 6:6 *rē'šîṯ* probably means simply "the best," with no reference to firstfruits: "You anoint yourselves with the finest oils." The same is true in Jer. 49:35: "I am going to break the bow of Elam, their strongest *(rē'šîṯ)* weapon"; and 1 S. 15:21: "From the spoil, the people took sheep and cattle, the best *(rē'šîṯ)* of the things devoted to destruction, to sacrifice to the Lord your God in Gilgal." Nu. 24:20 has a play on words involving *rē'šîṯ* and *'aḥ^{a}rîṯ:* "First/best among the nations was Amalek, but its end *('aḥ^{a}rîṯô)* is to perish forever."

III. Dead Sea Scrolls. The Dead Sea Scrolls use *rē'šîṯ* in basically the same way. It appears with the meaning "firstfruits" in 1QS 6:5,6; 1QSa 2:18,19, and with the meaning "beginning" in 1QS 10:1(twice),5,13(twice),15; 1QH 12:6; 1QM 1:1. As in the OT, *rē'šîṯ* refers to a limited time period (1QS 10:5; 1QH 12:6). In 1QS 10:1 it is used together with "end." It is used with infinitives in 1QS 10:13-16, where it is almost synonymous with "before."

The Qumran sect observed various festivals of firstfruits. In addition to the *'ōmer* (the first sheaf) immediately after Passover and the *bikkûrîm* festival for wheat fifty days later (Pentecost), prescribed in the OT, the Temple Scroll provides for a firstfruits festival for wine fifty days after Pentecost and another fifty days later for oil. Although the dates of the wine and oil festivals appear schematic and arbitrary, they do in fact correspond roughly to the time of the grape and olive harvests. Clearly a priest had to bless the firstfruits before the rest of the community could partake of them (1QSa 2:18-22; 1QS 6:5). The noun *rē'šîṯ* nevertheless occurs only once in the Temple Scroll (11QT 22:9). On the basis of this text, in part reconstructed, Yadin maintains that the priests could receive the foreleg, jawbone, and stomach of a sacrifice, and the Levites the shoulder, only when it was offered on a festival of firstfruits.[4] 11QT 60:7 shows, however, that the Levites received the shoulder from every legitimate sacrifice.

IV. Sirach. In Sirach *rē'šîṯ* has the meanings "beginning" and "best": *'lhym mbr'šṯ br' 'dm,* "God created humankind from the beginning" (Sir. 15:14); *šhw' mr'šyt lśmḥh*

4. Y. Yadin, *Temple Scroll,* 3 vols. (Jerusalem, 1983), 1:141-42, 153.

nwṣr, "[Wine], created from the beginning to make people happy" (34[31]:27); *qnh 'šh r'šyt qnyn,* "He who acquires a wife gains his best possession" (36:29; or "first possession"; cf. 36:24 LXX).

Rattray/Milgrom

רַב *rab;* רַב *rab* II; רוֹב/רֹב *rōb/rôb;* רָבַב *rābab* I; רְבָבָה *rᵉbābâ;* רָבָה *rābâ;* רִבּוֹ/רִבּוֹא *ribbô/ribbô';* רְבִיבִים *rᵉbîbîm;* אַרְבֶּה *'arbeh;* מַרְבֶּה *marbeh;* מַרְבִּית *marbît;* תַּרְבִּית *tarbît*

I. 1. Etymology and Occurrences; 2. Proper Names. II. OT Occurrences: 1. Distribution; 2. Constructions. III. Theological Contexts: 1. The Promise of Offspring; 2. The Increase of Israel; 3. Predicates of God; 4. Wisdom; 5. Inclusive Plural; 6. *marbît/tarbît.* IV. The Title "Rabbi." V. 1. LXX; 2. Dead Sea Scrolls.

---

rab. A. Ahuvia, "How Lonely Sits the City . . . Full of People," *BethM* 24 (1978/79) 423-25; A. Berlin, "On the Meaning of *rb,*" *JBL* 100 (1981) 90-93; E. Blum, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte. WMANT* 57 (1984); W. Brueggemann, "The Kerygma of the Priestly Writers," *ZAW* 84 (1972) 397-413; J. Carmignac, "*HRBYM:* les 'nombreux' ou les 'notables'?" *RevQ* 7 (1969/71) 575-86; S. J. D. Cohen "Epigraphical Rabbis," *JQR* 72 (1981/82) 1-17; M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography IX," *Bibl* 52 (1971) 337-56, esp. 353-54; P. Fronzaroli, *Studi sul lèssico comune semitico. AANLR* 19 (1964), esp. 246; M. Gilbert, "'Soyez féconds et multipliez' (Gn 1:28)," *NRT* 96 (1974) 729-42; W. Gross, "Israels Hoffnung auf die Erneuerung des Staats," in J. Schreiner, ed., *Unterwegs zur Kirche. QD* 110 (1987) 87-122; T. Hartmann, "רב *rab* viel," *THAT,* II, 715-26; J. Hoftijzer, *Die Verheissungen an die drei Erzväter* (Leiden, 1956); P. F. Jacobs, "An Examination of the Motif 'Life as Result or Reward' in the Book of Deuteronomy" (diss., Virginia, 1973); M. Köckert, *Vätergott und Väterverheissungen. FRLANT* 142 (1988); L. Kopf, "Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch," *VT* 8 (1958) 161-215, esp. 202; J. S. Kselman, "*rb // kbd,* a New Hebrew-Akkadian Formulaic Pair," *VT* 29 (1979) 110-14; E. Lipiński, "*Nešek* and *tarbît* in the Light of Epigraphical Evidence," *OLP* 10 (1979) 133; N. Lohfink, "Die Abänderung der Theologie des priesterlichen Geschichtswerks im Segen des Heiligkeitsgesetzes," *Wort und Geschichte. FS K. Elliger. AOAT* 18 (1973) 129-36; *idem,* "'Ich bin Jahwe, dein Arzt' (Ex 15,26), in *"Ich will euer Gott werden": Beispiele biblischen Redens von Gott. SBS* 100 (1981), 11-73; *idem,* "Die Priesterschrift und die Geschichte," *SVT* 29 (1978), 189-225; R. Rendtorff, *Das Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuch. BZAW* 147 (1976); G. Rinaldi, "*rb,*" *BiOr* 16 (1974) 32; H. Soloveitchik, "Pawnbroking: A Study in *Ribbit* and of the Halakah in Exile," *PAAJR* 38/39 (1970/71) 203-68; J. J. Stamm, "Zwei alttestamentliche Königsnamen," *Near Eastern Studies in Honor of W. F. Albright* (Baltimore, 1971), 443-52; O. H. Steck, *Der Schöpfungsbericht der Priesterschrift. FRLANT* 115 (²1981); idem, "Zions Tröstung," *Die Hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte. FS R. Rendtorff* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1990), 257-76; E. Strömberg Krantz, *Des Schiffes Weg mitten im Meer. CBOT* 19 (1982), esp. 178, 182, 187-88, 198; C. Westermann, "Types of Narrative in Genesis," *The Promises to the Fathers* (Eng. trans. Philadelphia, 1980), 1-94; B. Wiklander, "Begreppet Rabbim i Daniel 8–12," *SEÅ* 39 (1974) 59-73.

I. 1. *Etymology and Occurrences.* The various formatives derive from a Common Semitic biliteral root *rb,* expanded to *rbb* by reduplication of the second radical in West Semitic or lengthened to *rby/w* as in East Semitic.[1] Only the latter development appears in East Semitic; in the other Semitic languages both forms occur. There is no discernible occasion for semantic differentiation. Syriac and certain proper names also signal the existence of a prefixed form *yrb.*[2] All observed meanings share the common element "be large/many."

In the individual languages, however, along with broad semantic correspondences we also note quite a few differences in detail. In the G stem Akk. *rabû(m)/rabā'u(m),* "be(come) large,"[3] means "grow"; in the D stem it means "make large, raise, multiply, magnify," in the Š stem, "praise." The entity appearing as the subject of the verb or qualified by the adj. *rabû* can be almost anything.[4] Certain derivatives exhibit interesting semantic specialization: *rubû,* "prince," *rubûtu,* "principality"; from the D stem, *murabbânu,* "foster father," *murabbītu,* "foster mother," *tarbû/tarbītu,* "foster child," etc. Akk. *šarru rabbû* is the title of the "great king" (Heb. *meleḵ gāḏôl:* Ps. 47:3[Eng. 2]; *meleḵ rāḇ:* Ps. 48:3[2]).[5] Ugar. *rb* means "be great, be lord."[6] There may be a connection between Akk. *rabba'um* at Mari and the *rp'm* at Ugarit.[7] The expression *rb nqdm* probably denotes the head of a professional guild.[8] The root is also well attested in Phoenician.[9] Here too *raḇ* functions as a title; its specific meaning can be determined only by its relationship to other offices and functions.[10]

Aramaic in all its dialects makes copious use of this root.[11] In Old/Early Aramaic we already find the reduplicating form *rbrb* in the Barrakib Inscription (ca. 730 B.C.E.).[12] This is a *qalqal* form like *ra-ab-ra-bi-e* in the cuneiform Uruk text no. 11, with the meaning "great, mighty." In later Aramaic, *rb* appears as a divine epithet (*'l rb,* "God Almighty")[13] and as a word denoting "the old" in contrast to *z'wryh,* "the young." Already in Biblical Aramaic we find *rb* in the idiom *mll rbrbn,* "speak insolently, blasphemously" (Dnl. 7:8,11,20; etc.). The root is common in titles: *'m rbh,* "primal mother," as an epithet for Eve (1 En. 32:6);[14] *khn' rb',* "high priest" (T. Levi 41:7).[15] It is also used absolutely with the meaning "rabbi, expert in the law," pl. "nobility, aristo-

1. Meyer, II, 142.
2. See below.
3. *AHw,* II, 936ff.
4. Ibid.
5. A. Malamat, "The Kingdom of David and Solomon and the First Treaty with Egypt," *Bitsaron* 1/1-2 (1979) 7-14.
6. *WUS,* no. 2482; *UT,* no. 2297.
7. M. Helzer, *OLP* 9 (1978) 5-20; → רפאים *rᵉp̄ā'îm.*
8. M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *UF* 9 (1977) 336-37.
9. *DISO,* 270ff.; see also *KAI.*
10. On its relationship to the Phoenician suffetes, see J. Teixidor, *Sem* 29 (1979) 9-17.
11. *DISO,* 272; Beyer, 689-90.
12. *KAI,* 216.10; see also *AP,* 31.9, etc.
13. 4Q246.
14. Beyer, 242.
15. Beyer, 202.

crats."[16] The *qallān* form *rabbān,* attested in Biblical Aramaic in the *qalqal*[*ān*] form *rabrᵉbîn,* fem. *rabrᵉbān* and *rabrᵉbānîn* (a reduplicated pl. of *rab;*[17] cf. Dnl. 4:33[36]; 5:1-3,9-10,23; 6:18[17]), stands for "magnates, potentates, commanders."[18] Other nominal forms include *rᵉbû,* "greatness, magnificence" (Dnl. 4:19,33[22,36]; 5:18-19; 7:27), and *rby',* "officer."[19] Aramaic also has a verbal formation *rᵉbâ,* "grow, increase," pael "raise, rear,"[20] which represents the above-mentioned extension *rby/w.*[21]

Syr. *rab* and *rᵉbā*[22] and Mand. *rba* I[23] exhibit no unusual features. But Syriac does have a by-form *yrb,*[24] which many cite to explain certain OT personal names.[25]

The root appears also in South Semitic, with many derivatives: Arab. *rabba,* "be master, possess," II "raise, deify,"[26] *rabb,* "master, ruler," as well as *rabā,* "grow, increase, multiply," with many derivatives.[27] In Old South Arabic the root is not attested with complete certainty: *rbb,* "be master, possessor";[28] *rby/w,* "support, nourish, cause to grow."[29] The Ethiopic group, finally, emphasizes the aspect of extension, *rbb,* "expand, extend";[30] Amhar. *rebba,* "grow, be fruitful."[31] In the Tigre dialect *rabbi* has come to mean "God."[32]

The suggestion that the Semitic root *rb* is ultimately associated via a sound shift *r/l/n* with Egyp. *nb,* "lord, ruler,"[33] and *nb,* "all, every," is unlikely.[34]

2. *Proper Names.* It is not surprising that most Semitic languages used the household word *rb* to form personal names. The name *ilu-ra-bi,* "God is great," is already attested in the Kassite period.[35] We also find names with causative verbal elements: *yarbi-ilu, ya-ar-bi-AN,* "God has made great."[36] Also in this category is the early Canaanite name *Ḫammu-rabi.* Such *-rabi-* names are already found in Old Akkadian.[37] In Ugaritic we find the PNs *rb-il* and *il-rb,* "God is great, El has shown himself

16. *KAI,* 222A.39; etc.
17. S. Segert, *Altaramäische Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1975), 183.
18. *AP,* 3.11, etc.
19. Ahiqar 33:38; *AP,* 80.3; etc.
20. *AP,* 10.4; Ahiqar 18:25; Dnl. 4:8,17,30(11,20,33); etc.
21. For additional Late Aramaic and targumic formations see Beyer, 691.
22. *LexSyr,* 706-9.
23. *MdD,* 422.
24. *LexSyr,* 308-9.
25. See I.2 below.
26. Wehr, 320.
27. Wehr, 324.
28. ContiRossini, 235-36, with a question mark.
29. Beeston, 114; Biella, 476.
30. *LexLingAeth,* 286-87.
31. W. Leslau, *Cognates,* 102; *idem, Concise Amharic Dictionary* (Wiesbaden, 1976), 43.
32. *WbTigr,* 152.
33. *WbÄS,* II, 227-34.
34. Contra F. Calice, *Grundlagen der ägyptisch-semitischen Wortgleichung* (Vienna, 1936), 92.
35. A. T. Clay, *Personal Names from Cuneiform Inscriptions of the Cassite Period. YOS* 1 (1912), 195-96.
36. *APNM,* 70ff., 260; *AN,* 359.
37. *AHw,* II, 939.

great,"[38] as well as the toponym *t̲lrb.*[39] In Old South Arabic, Phoenician, Punic, and above all Nabatean, the name *rab(b) 'ēl* or *'ēl-rab(b),* "El is Lord," appears as the name of several Nabatean kings.[40] Finally, *rabbat,* "Lady," is the name of a goddess.[41]

At Hatra we find the hypocoristicon *rby,* "(A deity is) my Lord."[42] Here too we find the single-element name *rbn,* "master, teacher"; it is possible but unlikely that this name is a hypocoristicon *rb* + *n* for a divine name.

The well-attested biblical name *yārob̲'ām* (1 K. 11:26, etc.) appears already on an ancient Hebrew seal;[43] like the names *yᵉrubba'al* (Jgs. 6:32)[44] and the pejorativized *yᵉrubbōšet̲* (2 S. 11:21), this name comprises a theophorous element and the group of radicals *yrb* whose etymology is unclear. If it derives from *rb,* it means something like "may the ancestral god prove great"[45] or "may . . . give increase."[46] Another possibility is derivation from → ריב *rîb̲:* "the ancestral god has established justice."[47] In preexilic inscriptions, finally, the name *rbyhw* appears.[48]

The derivation and meaning of the name of Saul's daughter *mērab̲* are still debated. It appears in 1 S. 14:49 and 18:17,19; it may also derive from *rb* (or *yrb*[49]) and mean something like "increase." Emendation of the text has replaced it with "Michal" in 2 S. 21:8; this emendation may be based on an etymological semantic equivalence of the two names *(rab̲ = kōl).*

The common expression *rab̲-šāqēh* (2 K. 18:17,19; etc.) par. *rab̲-sārîs*[50] has probably been interpreted incorrectly by the OT writers as a personal name. Behind both stand not uncommon titles of Mesopotamian officials: *rab šāqû,* "commander in chief,"[51] and *ša rēši.*[52] The PN *rab̲-māg̲* in Jer. 39:3,13 derives from Akk. *rab-mugi* by way of Aram. *rbmg';* it designates an official of moderately high rank, whose function is far from clearly defined by the Greek translation *stratēgós.*[53]

Finally, *rbb* is the root of the toponym *rabbâ,* "the great city" (Josh. 13:25; 2 S. 11:1; etc.). Specific cities may be named: *rabbat bᵉnê 'ammôn* (Dt. 3:11; 2 S. 12:26; modern Amman from Gk. *rabbatámana*), *ṣîd̲ōn rabbâ* (Josh. 11:8; 19:28), *ḥᵃmat̲ rabbâ* (Am. 6:2), and *hārabbâ* (Josh. 15:60).[54] The city *hārabbît̲* (Josh. 19:20) was located in

38. *PNU,* 44, 96, 179; *WUS,* no. 249.
39. *WUS,* no. 2877.
40. *PNPI,* 111; Stamm, 449-52.
41. Benz, 408.
42. S. Abbadi, *Die Personennamen der Inschriften aus Hatra* (Hildesheim, 1983), 161.
43. J. D. Fowler, *Theophoric Personal Names in Ancient Hebrew. JSOTSup* 49 (1988), 359.
44. See *HAL,* III, 434.
45. *IPN,* 206ff.
46. W. F. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel* (Baltimore, ⁵1968), 205 n. 57.
47. Stamm, 451; *PNU,* 179.
48. R. Lawton, *Bibl* 65 (1984) 344.
49. J. J. Stamm, *SVT* 16 (1967), 333.
50. → סריס *sārîs;* → X, 348-49.
51. M. Ellenbogen, *Foreign Words in the OT* (London, 1962), 152.
52. → ראש *rō'š;* → X, 345-46.
53. E. Benveniste, *REJ* 82 (1926) 55-56; Ellenbogen, 151; *HAL,* II, 543.
54. *GTTOT,* 120, 151, 184-85.

the territory of Issachar and may be identified with Qishon.[55] Finally, Cant. 7:5(4) speaks of the "gate of Bath-rabbim," said to be located by the pools of Heshbon, east of the Jordan. Perhaps the text does not refer to an actual locale but is a metaphor intended to evoke the multitudes from the steppe that hasten to refresh themselves at the pools.[56]

II. OT Occurrences.

1. *Distribution.* Before examining the distribution of the root in the OT, we must decide whether it is distinct from *rbb* II, "throw,"[57] **rab* II, "shooter? projectile?" (Jer. 50:29; Job 16:13; Prov. 26:10), and *rbh* II, found only as a qal participle meaning "shooter" (Gen. 21:20; Jer. 16:16?). There is in fact almost no semantic connection with *rāḇaḇ/rāḇâ.* We are dealing either with two homonymous roots or a sound shift *m* > *b* affecting the root *rmh.*[58]

The verb *rbb* I occurs 24 times in the OT, from the early monarchy to postexilic wisdom literature. Qal forms clearly predominate; only in Ps. 144:13 do we find a pual. The noun *rōḇ* occurs 151 times, with a noteworthy concentration in postexilic literature. The adj. *raḇ,* with 413 occurrences, is an everyday OT word. In addition to these 413, Even-Shoshan lists a separate *raḇ* II, "enough" (13 occurrences), *raḇ* in official titles (35 occurrences), and 15 Aramaic occurrences, for a total of 476.[59] There is nothing distinctive about the distribution.[60] The noun *rᵉḇāḇâ* occurs 16 times, *ribbô/ribbô'* 11 times (only in late postexilic literature: Ezr. 2:64; Neh. 7:66,71), the long form in Ezra and Daniel; only in Neh. 7:70-71(71-72) do the two forms stand side by side. Finally, the noun *rᵉḇîḇîm* occurs 6 times (Dt. 32:2; Jer. 3:3; 14:22; Mic. 5:6[7]; Ps. 65:11[10]; 72:6). Whether *rᵉḇîḇîm,* "showers," is associated with the root *rbb* has not been demonstrated. References to Ugar. *rby* ("rain?"),[61] *rb/rbb,*[62] or even Akk. *rabābu,* "grow weak,"[63] are of little use.

There are 176 occurrences of the Hebrew verb *rāḇâ* I: 59 in the qal, 4 in the piel, 113 in the hiphil; and in Aramaic 5 in the peal and 1 in the pael. There are 24 occurrences of the nominal derivative *'arbeh,* "locust"; it does not derive from *rbh* II, "throw, hunt," but possibly from *rbh* I. It must be an early derivative, since Akk. *erbu*[64] and Ugar. *irby*[65] exhibit the same preformative.[66] This noun embodies the concrete human experience of a destructive creature encountered as an innumerable multitude, a swarm — the locust. Other derivatives include *marbeh,* "multitude" (Isa. 9:6[7]; 33:23; possi-

55. Ibid., 77.
56. O. Keel, *ZBK* 18, 218; W. Rudolph, *Hohelied. KAT* XVII/1-3 (1962), 173.
57. *HAL; GesB,* 740, 742.
58. *VG,* I, 228.
59. Even-Shoshan, 1055.
60. For details see Hartmann, 717.
61. *KBL*², 870.
62. *UT,* no. 2298.
63. Hartmann, 722; cf. *AHw,* II, 933.
64. *AHw,* I, 234.
65. J. Sasson, *RSP,* I, 395-96.
66. See also *DISO,* 23; *GesB*¹⁸, 94.

bly from a hiphil ptcp.);[67] *marbîṯ,* "greater part, interest surcharge" (5 occurrences; already found in Egyptian Aramaic with the meaning "interest"[68]); *tarbîṯ,* "interest, increase" (6 occurrences, 4 in Ezekiel);[69] *tarbûṯ,* a pejorative term for "brood, rabble" (Nu. 32:14); and finally *mirbâ,* "amplitude" (Ezk. 23:32).[70]

2. *Constructions.* Although the two verbs *rbb* and *rbh* do not differ semantically, their differing frequencies and their clearly different openness to syntactic variation are striking. The verb *rbb,* found primarily in the qal, forms derivatives that are very common, whereas the common verb *rbh* in the qal, piel, and hiphil forms nominal derivatives that are attested only sparsely.

Only stative, infinitive, and participial forms of *rāḇaḇ* ("be great, numerous") are found. In combination with *min,* it normally has a comparative meaning ("greater/more than," e.g., Dt. 7:7); with *ʿal* it means "too much" (e.g., Ex. 23:29).[71]

In the case of *rāḇâ,* the high proportion of factitive forms (some 80 times) and the stereotyped hiphil inf. *harbēh* (some 50 times) are striking. Here too construction with *min* conveys a comparative sense ("be greater than," e.g., Gen. 43:34), as does construction with the hiphil ("make more numerous than," e.g., Ezk. 16:51). This verb is especially common combined with other verbs, with the meaning "do something frequently," "do something more than," thus becoming simply an auxiliary verb. Finally, certain combinations convey an idiomatic meaning: *yirbû hayyāmîm,* "time passes" (Gen. 38:12); *yirbeh hadderek̲,* "the distance is too *(min)* great" (Dt. 14:24).[72] The piel is used factitively: "make great/numerous, multiply."[73]

The nominal adj. *rab* appears in many combinations,[74] of which examples of only the most common can be listed here: *gôy rab̲,* "a great nation" (Dt. 9:14; 26:5); *hāmôn rab̲,* "great commotion" (Isa. 16:14); *ṭûb̲ rab̲,* "great goodness" (Ps. 31:20[19]); *miqneh rab̲,* "much livestock" (Dt. 3:19); *ʿam rab̲,* "a great nation" (Dt. 20:1, also comparative); *qāhāl rab̲,* "great company" (Ezk. 17:17); *rᵉk̲ûš rab̲,* "great possessions" (Gen. 13:6); *šālāl rab̲,* "much spoil" (2 S. 3:22); there follow *rab̲-ḥesed̲,* "abounding in steadfast love" (Nu. 14:18); *rab̲-ʾᵉmeṯ,* "abounding in faithfulness" (Ex. 34:6); *rab̲-pᵉʿālîm,* "a doer of great deeds" (2 S. 23:20 par. 1 Ch. 11:22); we also find *makkâ rabbâ,* "a great blow" (Nu. 11:33); *rāʿaṯ rabbâ,* "great wickedness" (Gen. 6:5); *tᵉhôm rabbâ,* "the great deep" (Gen. 7:11; Sir. 43:23a,25b); cf. *mayim rabbîm,* "abundant water" (Nu. 20:11)[75] but also "torrents" (Isa. 17:13; some 30 times, including Ezk. 11, Jer. 3, and Ps. 7). Other plural phrases include: *bānîm rabbîm,* "many sons" (Isa. 54:1;

---

67. *BLe,* §61mζ.
68. *DISO,* 167; *AP,* 10.4,6,8,11,12,14,16,18; 11.8-9; etc.
69. See III.6 below.
70. But see W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 477: *marbâ.*
71. For Dt. 14:24 see below.
72. See also Hartmann, 718.
73. *HP,* 108-9.
74. Even-Shoshan, 1052-53.
75. → מים *mayim,* VIII, 275, 283.

1 Ch. 4:27; 24:4; 28:5 — all late!); *ḥălālîm rabbîm,* "many wounded" (Jgs. 9:40); *yāmîm rabbîm,* "many days, a long time" (Gen. 21:34). Alongside *gôyîm rabbîm* (18 times, primarily in Deuteronomy, Ezekiel, and Jeremiah), we find the synonymous *'ammîm rabbîm* (19 times, primarily in Ezekiel; not found in Deuteronomy or Jeremiah); parallel occurrences in Ezk. 38:22-23, Mic. 4:2-3, and Hab. 2:8ff. reveal no semantic difference. The phrase *raḥămîm rabbîm,* "many mercies," appears in late texts (Dnl. 9:18; Neh. 9:19,27,31; Ps. 119:156; cf. 2 S. 24:14[!]; 1 Ch. 21:13).

Phrases using the noun *rob* (more than 50 times) likewise exhibit great variety, illustrated by a few examples: *rob-'ādām,* "a crowd of people"; *rōb bānîm,* "many sons"; *rōb bᵉhēmâ,* "many cattle"; *rōb ḥokmâ,* "abundance of wisdom"; *rōb ḥesed,* "abundance of mercy"; *rōb yāmîm,* "many days, a long time"; *rōb kōaḥ,* "great strength."

The noun *rᵉbābâ,* "enormous quantity," serves as the word for "ten thousand" (Lev. 26:8; Dt. 32:30; Jgs. 20:10); half its occurrences are in the plural, denoting an innumerable quantity, especially in combination with *'ălāpîm,* "thousands" (Nu. 10:36; cf. Gen. 24:60). The precise word for "ten thousand" is the Canaanite loanword *ribbô'/ribbô* (Dnl. 11:12; Ezr. 2:64,69; Neh. 7:70-71[71-72]). The rare noun formation itself argues for Canaanite origin.[76] The restriction of this word to late postexilic literature does not contradict the theory that it is a loanword.

Fabry

III. Theological Contexts.

1. *The Promise of Offspring.* Although the lexemes of this word group occur often, they rarely convey a specifically theological meaning. Among the exceptions, the most important is the use of the word group in promises of many offspring. Here again, however, the group is associated only with a portion of the passages bearing on this theme — an observation that reminds us of the limits of the word-study approach.

a. *Outside P.* In the non-Priestly patriarchal narrative, the promise of many offspring appears in two basic forms: God's promise to Abraham (Gen. 12:2; 18:18), Ishmael (21:13,18), and Jacob (46:3) to make them a nation (*gôy* [*gāḏôl*]), a promise also made to Moses (Ex. 32:10 par. Dt. 9:14; Nu. 14:12); and the promise to multiply the offspring of the patriarchs.[77]

As linguistic considerations would lead us to expect, occurrences using the hiphil of *rbh* are restricted to the second form, which constitutes the largest group: Gen. 16:10; 22:17; 26:4,24; Ex. 32:13 (other instances use *hāyâ/śîm* and *ka'ăpar hā'āreṣ/kᵉḥôl hayyām:* Gen. 13:16; 28:14; 32:13).[78] The composition of these passages is demonstrably similar: they are all formulated with the hiphil of *rbh,* spoken by God in the first person, with *zera'* (of the patriarchs) as object. Three texts characterize the promise as an oath sworn by Yahweh (Gen. 22:16-17; 26:3-4; Ex. 32:13); the last two explicitly cite the oath in Gen. 22:17. These three passages liken the patriarch's offspring to the

76. Wagner, no. 275.
77. H. H. Schmid, *Der sogenannte Jahwist* (Zurich, 1976), 127-28.
78. On Gen. 15:5 see below.

"stars of heaven" *(kᵉkôkᵉbê haššāmayim).* Three texts (Gen. 22:17; 26:4,24) base the promise on the testing of Abraham (in Gen. 22); here the promise of increase is linked closely with the promise of a blessing.

The "central text" of this group is the second speech of the angel after the testing of Abraham (22:15-18), as may be seen from its emphatic structure: introduction as an oath Yahweh swears "by himself" *(bî nišbaʿtî nᵉʾum yhwh,* v. 16a), an inclusio repeating the reason for the promise (vv. 16b par. 18b, *yaʿan ʾᵃšer* par. *ʿēqeb ʾᵃšer*), and a second inclusio promising a blessing (v. $17a\alpha_1$ with emphatic *bārēk ʾᵃbārekᵉkā* par. v. 18a with *wᵉhitbārᵃkû bᵉzarʿᵃkā kōl gôyê hāʾāreṣ*). The promise of increase (along with a promise of the land formulated to reflect the blessing in 24:60b) stands in the center, itself emphasized by the infinitive absolute and a double comparison found only here: *harbâ ʾarbeh ʾet-zarʿᵃkā kᵉkôkᵉbê haššāmayim wᵉkaḥôl ʾᵃšer ʿal-śᵉpat hayyām* (v. 17). The context, too, is sharply contoured: Abraham, who did not withhold his only son (v. 16), is rewarded with abundant offspring.[79] This represents a shift in accent with respect to the original narrative, in which Abraham's fear of God is not expressed solely through his obedience.[80]

The first promise to Isaac in 26:3-5 is modeled unmistakably on 22:15-18, even though the immediate context shifts the primary emphasis to the promise of the land.[81] This promise, which also exhibits concentric structure, incorporates some of the actual wording of 22:15-18: 26:5a = 22:18b (Abraham's obedience; is 26:5b a later addition? [cf. linguistic usage]); 26:4b = 22:18a. The actual promise of increase in $26:4a\alpha$ *(wᵉhirbêtî ʾet-zarʿᵃkā kᵉkôkᵉbê haššāmayim)* is a "simplified" quotation of 22:17a, as the introductory reference to the oath sworn to Abraham underlines (v. 3b). Of the elements previously identified, the second promise in Gen. 26 (v. 24) incorporates the promise of a blessing, (in fulfillment of this promise) the promise of many offspring *(wᵉhirbêtî ʾet-zarʿᵃkā,* without any comparison), and the motivating reference to Abraham.

That Ex. 32:13 reflects Gen. 22 and 26 is clear, especially from the introduction, which corresponds precisely to Gen. 22:17 *(nišbaʿtā lāhem bāk),* but also from the words *ʾarbeh ʾet-zarʿᵃkem kᵉkôkᵉbê haššāmayim* (cf. Gen. 26:4). In contrast to the repeated promise of the land (Ex. 13:5,11; 32:13; 33:1; Nu. 11:12; 14:16,23; 32:11), it is noteworthy that the promise to the patriarchs of many offspring occurs only here in Exodus–Numbers. Contextually, of course, it lies close to hand, in that Moses must intercede (Ex. 32:11-13) to prevent God from carrying out the threat to destroy the people (v. 10). In the analogous situation of Nu. 14:11ff., by contrast, the theme of the land is already paramount in the core narrative.

Closely related is the promise to Hagar and Ishmael in Gen. 16:10: its formulation echoes that of 22:17 word for word *(harbâ ʾarbeh ʾet-zarʿēk).* Here, however, in the case of Abraham's collateral line, there is no "oath"; and the multitude of offspring is

79. For a different reading see R. W. L. Moberly, *VT* 38 (1988) 320-21.
80. See Blum, 322ff.
81. Blum, 363-64, with bibliog.; Köckert, 171ff.

expressed not by a comparison but by the innumerability formula (*w^elō' yissāp̄ēr mērōḇ;* cf. Gen. 32:13[12]).

Like the promises in general,[82] the texts in this group comprise redactional and compositional elements, as is exhibited clearly by the textual structure of Gen. 16:10 and 22:15-18.[83] More precisely, they belong to a compositional stratum of the Pentateuch that can be called a "D composition" and assigned to the Dtr tradition (in the broader sense). The nature of this relationship should be examined in detail by profiling the individual texts and their connections, but can be identified from the components of the promise of increase. (1) In Deuteronomy (as in Exodus and Numbers), the promise of increase takes a back seat to the promise of the land. But when the text does refer to such a promise to the "fathers," it is stated as a sworn[84] increase (formulated with the hiphil of *rāḇâ;* cf. Dt. 13:18(17) and 7:12-13. In the latter text increase and fertility (v. 13) represent the substance of the *b^erîṯ* cited in v. 12. (2) The formulation using the hiphil of *rāḇâ* with *zera'* reappears exclusively in texts that bear a Dtr stamp: Josh. 24:3 (*wā'arbeh 'eṯ-zar'ô,* referring to Abraham) and Jer. 33:22 (as a promise to the descendants of David, with the innumerability formula and comparison to the *ṣ^eḇā' haššāmayim*) (cf. also Dnl. 3:36 LXX). (3) In addition to the D passages just cited, comparison to the stars of heaven appears in Dtn/Dtr and related texts: Dt. 1:10, 10:22, and 28:62 *(k^ek̠ôk̠^eḇê haššāmayim lārōḇ);* Neh. 9:23 *(b^enêhem hirbîṯā k^ek̠ôk̠^eḇê haššāmayim);* 1 Ch. 27:23, similar to the innumerability formula *lō' yissāp̄ēr mērōḇ* in Gen. 16:10 and 32:13;[85] 1 K. 3:8; 8:5 par. 2 Ch. 5:6; Jer. 33:22; Hos. 2:1(1:10). (4) This group of texts attaches particular weight to the emphasis on Abraham's conduct as the motivation for the promise. Abraham, the very paradigm of obedience, for whose sake God's sworn promise is renewed, has his closest parallel in the figure of David in the Dtr History. There David is the "prototype of God's perfectly obedient anointed"[86] and at the same time the *'eḇeḏ* for whose sake Yahweh preserves the Davidides' line and Judah despite their disobedience (1 K. 11:13,32,36; 15:4; 2 K. 8:19), although the two aspects are never linked explicitly (as in Ps. 132 [v. 10, *ba'^aḇûr dāwiḏ 'aḇdek̠ā* — Gen. 26:24, *ba'^aḇûr 'aḇrāhām 'aḇdî*]). Gen. 22:15ff., etc., take this association a step further: insofar as the promise is realized in the present, Abraham's fear of God takes on in the reader's eyes an almost vicarious significance.[87] (5) Some of these features cluster in Gen. 15, the foundational text of D's promise of the land (as an oath/*b^erîṯ*): here, and only here, the promises are introduced as a "reward" for Abraham (v. 1, *ś^ek̠ār^ek̠ā harbēh m^e'ōḏ;* v. 6, Abraham's faith reckoned as *ṣ^eḏāqâ*). As is consonant with the general character of the chapter, the promise of increase is developed in narrative form,

---

82. See Hoftijzer, Westermann, Rendtorff, et al.

83. See, e.g., Blum, 317, 320; for a different reading of 22:15ff., see J. Van Seters, *Abraham in History and Tradition* (New Haven, 1975), 230ff.

84. → שׁבע *šb'* niphal.

85. See Blum, 154ff.

86. G. von Rad, *GSAT. ThB* 8 (1958), 201, with documentation.

87. Köckert, 176, with n. 57, citing the salvific historical role of Abraham in noncanonical documents.

with the elements of the "stars of heaven" and "innumerability" (used formulaically by later texts) incorporated into the setting (vv. 4-5, without the hiphil of *rbh*). When ch. 15 is considered as a whole, nevertheless, "increase" is more important than "land." Therefore the sworn promise of increase in Gen. 22, with the significant possibility of annexation,[88] is reserved for another time. It is here and in the Isaac narrative that follows (ch. 26) that the D promises have their clear focus. Do we find here within the Bible itself the beginnings of the extraordinary influence exercised by the story of the "binding of Isaac"?[89]

The traditional hypotheses concerning the literary composition of the Pentateuch consider most of these passages (e.g., Gen. 22:15ff.; Ex. 32:7ff.) to be relatively late redactional elements ("JE" or "Dtr"). But if we trace instead the connections identified here through the rest of the Pentateuch, we discover a large-scale composition that already presupposes and incorporates the Dtr History.[90] In any event this group of "increase" texts presupposes the historical catastrophe of Judah; against this background these passages are formulated to insist with all possible emphasis on Yahweh's self-assumed obligation to the future of the nation. Fundamentally, this is also the historical context of all the other promise texts to be discussed below.[91]

Yet another element characterizes all the texts belonging to this group: the consistent association of increase and blessing. In many cases fertility and increase are the substance par excellence of the blessing.

b. *P.* In the Priestly texts of the Pentateuch, the blessing of increase is expressed characteristically by the joint usage of the lexemes → פרה *pārâ* and *rāḇâ* qal/hiphil, a combination that appears in Gen. 1:22,28; 8:17; 9:1,7; 17:2,6,20; 28:3; 35:11; 47:27; 48:4; Ex. 1:7; Lev. 26:9). As a rule, to express a blessing these lexemes use the qal imperative (e.g., Gen. 28:3) or the hiphil jussive (except Gen. 17:20 [*wᵉ* perfective] and 48:4 [*hinnēh* plus hiphil ptcp.]), introduced by the piel of *brk*. The exceptions are the promises in Gen. 17:2 + 6 and Lev. 26:9 (in each case coupled with *bᵉrîṯ*), the declaration in Gen. 8:17, and of course the confirmation of increase in Gen. 47:27 and Ex. 1:7. Together with other themes characteristic of P, the promises of increase shape the fundamental structure of the "creation story," i.e., the order imposed by God during creation.

The blessing of the creatures of the water and air (Gen. 1:22) and of humankind (1:28) includes both increase *(pᵉrû ûrᵉḇû)* and "filling" *(mil'û)* their assigned space; human beings are also to "subdue" *(kbš)* the earth (through agriculture?) and have dominion over the animals (v. 28b). The blessing is an integral element of the "debut" of these works of creation; it makes their ongoing existence possible.[92] That the land ani-

---

88. See above.

89. Moberly, *VT* 38 (1988) 322.

90. E. Blum, "Israël à la montagne de Dieu," in A. de Pury, ed., *Le Pentateuque en question* (Geneva, 1989), 271-95.

91. But cf. the discussion of Jer. 30:19 below.

92. O. H. Steck, *Der Schöpfungsbericht der Priesterschrift. FRLANT* 116 (1981), 65, 68-69, 156.

mals are not blessed with increase (v. 25) is an aspect of God's plan to prevent conflict between human beings and the animals that share their domain. The same purpose is served by assigning humankind a strictly vegetarian diet, different from that of the animals (vv. 29-30).

Following the transitional *wayᵉhî-ḵēn* (v. 30),[93] the completion of this dispensation is set in the framework of the primal history: provision of the human diet and the relationship between humankind and animals primarily in the non-Priestly (!) material in Gen. 2ff., increase in the genealogies (Gen. 5) and also in 6:1 (*hēḥēl hāʾāḏām lārōḇ ʿal-pᵉnê hāʾᵃḏāmâ* [!]). The concrete nature of the blessing bestowed at creation precludes a close typological association with Israel in exile,[94] but it also argues against connecting 1:28 with Israel's history in a promise-fulfillment schema.[95] Indeed, the dispensation described in 1:28-30 has its own history: after the outbreak of violence (*ḥāmās*, 6:11; cf. ch. 4) and the deluge, an altered dispensation is restricted to "limiting conflict"; cf. the permission to eat flesh and the new quality of human dominion over animals in 9:2-5/6. The animals are accordingly promised increase (although not as a blessing) in 8:17b: *wᵉšārᵉṣû bāʾāreṣ ûpārû wᵉrāḇû ʿal-hāʾāreṣ*. By contrast, the blessing bestowed on humankind in 9:1b stands for continuity: *pᵉrû ûrᵉḇû ûmilʾû ʾeṯ-hāʾāreṣ*. It incorporates the wording of 1:28; together with v. 7, it constitutes an inclusio surrounding the new settlement (vv. 2-6).

(The redundancy in 9:7 in usually mitigated by emending the concluding *ûrᵉḇû-ḇâ* to *ûrᵉḏû-ḇâ*, parallel to 1:28. But the parallel with 1:28 is not precise: there *rāḏâ* refers to the animals, not the earth. Furthermore, the long text of several LXX mss. [*katakyrieúsate autḗs* in addition to *plēthýnesthe ep' autḗs*] reflects *kiḇšuhā* in 1:28 [and 9:1 LXX].)

The promise of the blessing of increase to the patriarchs of Israel (together with other signals such as 17:2b taken with 9:7) marks a new beginning in the created order. Its striking distribution (to Abraham in a single passage, ch. 17; never to Isaac; three times to Jacob, 28:3; 35:11; 48:4) is complementary to the distribution of the pre-P promises. In the Jacob narrative these passages also serve a structural purpose: they stand at the beginning and end of Jacob's stay at Paddan-aram (in the context of the Bethel traditions) and at the end of his life.

The structure of Gen. 17 is unusual in several ways: *prh* and *rbh* hiphil are assigned to two different statements spoken by God (vv. 2,6); *rbh* hiphil comes first and is connected not with *brk* but with a "personal" *bᵉrîṯ* for Abraham (vv. 2-6). These peculiarities and the emphasis of the wording reflect the fundamental place of this passage in the composition, not only as the beginning of the Israelite lineage but also with reference to the role of Abraham's childlessness (with Sarah) in the immediate context. Its ties with the other passages are nevertheless preserved. The association of the expressions is signalized through the parallel formulations *wᵉʾarbeh ʾōṯᵉḵā bimʾōḏ mᵉʾōḏ* (v. 2)

93. Steck.
94. Brueggemann.
95. Lohfink, "Priesterschrift."

and *w^ehiprēṯî 'ōṯ^ekā bim'ōḏ m^e'ōḏ* (v. 6). Even the different sequence of the verbal expressions appears not to be accidental: if we include *brk* piel in v. 16 (referring to Sarah in MT, to Isaac in LXX), the usual triad appears here in reverse order,[96] returning to the usual ordering in v. 20, the promise for Ishmael.

Common to all the Priestly patriarchal texts is the blessing or *b^erîṯ* promising increase, expanded with the promise of becoming a nation. Abraham's name is interpreted as *'aḇ-h^amôn gôyim* (17:5); he and Sarah will become "nations" *(gôyim),* and "kings (of nations)" *(m^elāḵîm/malḵê 'ammîm)* will come from them (vv. 6,16) (cf. the blessing for Ishmael in v. 20: "twelve princes [*n^eśî'im*]," "a great nation"). Thus with the nations descended from Abraham humankind continues to spread, a development standing in sharp contrast to the association of the *b^erîṯ* with Isaac alone (vv. 19,21). In the case of Jacob, he is to become a *q^ehal 'ammîm* (28:3; 48:4), a *gôy ûq^ehal gôyim* (35:11; cf. the promise of kings of v. 11b). Since the promise to Jacob can extend only to Israel, *q^ehal 'ammîm* may be interpreted as meaning "a company of tribes."[97] But the expression *q^ehal gôyim* in 35:11 remains problematic. It is possible that here (uniquely) *gôyim* refers to the tribes of Israel or that it alludes to the northern and southern kingdoms.[98] More likely, it is a hyperbolic expression suggesting multitudes, analogous to *m^elō' haggôyim* in 48:19b (describing Ephraim!).[99]

Gen. 47:27 and Ex. 1:7 describe the increase of Israel in Egypt. The "doublet" creates a compositional bracket, which may also have played some role when the text had to be divided into "books." Ex. 1:7, however, differs from the standard formulation in several respects. It is true that — except for → עצם *'āṣam* — all the elements of this verse appear in the parallel passages (*šāraṣ,* Gen. 8:17; 9:7; *bim'ōḏ m^e'ōḏ,* 17:2,6; *mālē' 'eṯ-hā'āreṣ,* 1:28; 9:1). It is striking, however, that the sequence of four (!) verbs abandons the firm linkage of *pārâ* with *rāḇâ* found everywhere else. The fact that *rāḇâ* is also linked with *'āṣam* in the immediate context (Ex. 1:9,20), which is not associated with P, requires explanation. These observations have led scholars to posit a secondary redactional assimilation of the "P" text,[100] but this theory does not explain the dissolution of the *rāḇâ — pārâ* combination. It is simpler to assume that in the P text itself the context induced the association of *wayyirbû* and *wayya'aṣmû* and that completion of the expression with *pārâ* evoked yet a fourth verb.

The Priestly promise of increase appears for the last time in Lev. 26:9: *w^ehiprêṯî 'eṯkem w^ehirbêṯî 'eṯkem.* The wording corresponds to Gen. 17 (vv. 2,6,20), as does the association with *brîṯî* (cf. also the sequence in Gen. 9:7,9). The context is a passage that summarizes the primary themes of the Priestly composition[101] and completes a conceptual structure.[102] At the same time, the sum of the promises for Israel is here re-

96. Lohfink, "Abänderung," 131 n. 3.
97. Gross, 95-96.
98. Blum, 457.
99. On the image of Israel's political structure implicit here, see esp. Gross.
100. W. H. Schmidt, *Exodus. BK* II/1 (1988), 11-12, with bibliog.
101. Lohfink, "Abänderung," 18.
102. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch. BZAW* 189 (1990), 257ff.

lated parenetically to the alternatives of blessing or curse (Lev. 26:1ff.). According to Lohfink, this feature signals a conceptual shift on the part of P^G in the direction of Dtn theology. But one must ask whether the fundamental elimination of all responsibility on the part of Israel posited as the Priestly conception of the promises is conceivable in the formation of the Dtn tradition, which seeks to "understand" theologically the catastrophic experience of the exile. The very sequence of an unconditional, unlimited blessing of increase followed by a "conditional" promise of increase probably does reflect the sequence, characteristic of the P corpus as a whole, of an unconditional divine dispensation followed by a parenetic demand for Israel's compliance (Lev. 11ff.); Israel's failure to comply is fundamentally transcended by the *beriṯ* established once for all time (Lev. 26:41ff.).

2. *The Increase of Israel.*

a. *Exodus.* Only once does the increase of Israel serve to motivate the narrative: in Ex. 1 Pharaoh fears that the Israelites *('am benê yiśrā'ēl)* have become too numerous *(raḇ we'āṣûm mimmennû,* v. 9) and may continue to increase *(pen-yirbeh)* and turn into a "fifth column" (v. 10). In response he subjects them to oppressive forced labor. But the more the people are oppressed, the more they multiply *(yirbeh* par. *yiprōṣ).* Pharaoh's further measures are therefore aimed directly at this increase. First the midwives are secretly ordered to kill every newborn Hebrew boy. But the midwives' fear of God frustrates this plan, and once again the narrative describes the increase of the Israelites *(wayyirbû hā'ām wayya'aṣmû me'ōḏ,* v. 20[103]). Now Pharaoh has no choice but openly to command his people to slay the Israelite boys (v. 22). But this command, too, is not carried out — at least for the sake of the narrative. Instead, the unusual wording of the command already anticipates the birth and preservation of the deliverer (2:1-10). In Ex. 1, in short, the very increase of the Israelites in number is an expression of God's work behind the scenes.

The redundancy in vv. 20 and 21 has long been noted. Since vv. 20a and 21b constitute a coherent narrative, it is possible to treat the description of increase in v. 20b as secondary, tied in by the recapitulation in v. 21a.[104] But it is also possible to treat the whole of v. 21 as secondary, explicating v. 20a in the spirit of v. 20b.[105] However that may be, v. 20b forms an inclusio with v. 9b and also echoes v. 12a, artfully rounding off the narrative before the final climax.

It is not by accident that the theme of Israel's great numbers, found in Ex. 1, reappears in 5:5 in a question asked by Pharaoh, after his first negotiations with Moses about letting the people leave and before the drastic intensification of their forced labor: "Now they are more numerous *(rabbîm)* than the people of the land *(mē'am hā'āreṣ),* and yet you want them to stop working?" The unresolved problem of permission to leave aggravates the conflict.

---

103. Cf. *BHS.*
104. B. Baentsch, *Exodus. HKAT* I/2, 9.
105. Schmidt, *BK* II/1 (1903), 19.

The basic idea expressed in v. 5a remains at bottom the same whether one follows the reading of the MT (*'am hā'āreṣ* as the subject of a nominal clause) or that of the Samaritan text *(mē'am hā'āreṣ)*. In the first case, it is necessary to posit a special meaning for *'am hā'āreṣ;*[106] in the second, the absence of a pronominal subject makes the syntax rather awkward. The latter (along with the idea expressed in 1:7b?) could, of course, have induced the reading of the MT.

The start of the pre-Priestly exodus story finds a last narrative echo at the beginning of the Balaam narrative: the great number of the Israelites who have left Egypt arouses fear among the Moabites and their king, who therefore seek help from Balaam (Nu. 22:3-6). The agreement of Nu. 22:3b *(wayyāqoṣ mô'āb̲ mippᵉnê bᵉnê yiśrā'ēl)* with Ex. 1:12b *(wayyāquṣû mippᵉnê bᵉnê yiśrā'ēl)* can practically be treated as a quotation from Ex. 1.[107] The description of the people as being (too) *rab̲* and *'āṣûm* (Ex. 1:9b) reappears, albeit in two separate statements: "Moab was in great dread of the people, *kî rab̲ hû'*" (v. 3a); and "Come now, curse this people for me, *kî-'āṣûm hû' mimmennû*" (v. 6). These expressions evoke corresponding associations and expectations in the recipients; they presuppose familiarity with the exodus tradition, not necessarily a compositional relationship.[108]

b. *Deuteronomy and the Dtr History.* In Deuteronomy one strand of tradition cites the observed increase of Israel as proof of Yahweh's favor. This theme appears first in Dt. 1:10 (citing Moses at Horeb!): "Yahweh your God has multiplied you *(hirbâ 'et̲kem)*, so that today you are as numerous as the stars of heaven" (there follows an optative blessing expressing the wish for further increase [*yōsēp̄ ʿᵃlêḵem*]). A similar formulation appears in 10:22: "Your ancestors went down to Egypt seventy persons; and now Yahweh your God has made you as numerous as the stars in heaven." Finally, the so-called short historical credo formulates the same notion in terms of becoming a nation (26:5): the ancestor who went to Egypt "lived there as an alien, few in number, and there became a great nation, mighty and populous *(gôy gāḏôl 'āṣûm wārāb̲)*."[109] The multiplication of the Israelites in Egypt is not ascribed explicitly to an act of God, but the pointed contrast between the "wandering" ancestor with a few people and the enormous number of their descendants has clear miraculous overtones. This element is rare in the historical summaries of the OT; only here is it given such prominence.

Its only reappearance is in Ps. 105, again in contrast to the scanty numbers of the Israelites in the time of the patriarchs (cf. Ps. 105:12 with Dt. 26:5a) and with the sequence: aliens in Egypt (v. 23) — increase (v. 24) — oppression by the Egyptians (v. 25). Ps. 105 explicitly makes this increase an act of Yahweh *(wayyeper 'et̲-'ammô mᵉ'ōḏ)*; it reflects the fully developed Pentateuch, not just Dt. 26 (cf. v. 24 with Ex. 1:7).

---

106. *GesB,* 597: "rabble, mob."

107. W. Gross, *Bileam. SANT* 38 (1974), 65, 90-91, 146-47, considers Nu. 22:3b an isolated addendum "echoing Ex. 1:12." But do the reasons for positing a doublet lose their force when one thinks in terms of "quotation" (in part also in v. 3a)?

108. → XI, 298-99.

109. On the use of the singular see → XI, 299.

Israel's increase is also mentioned in Josh. 24:3 — which speaks only in general terms of Abraham's offspring — and Neh. 9:23, which surprisingly associates the increase with the entrance into Canaan. Most striking is the absence of any reference to Israel's increase in 1 S. 12:8, where the reader must also supply the oppression by the Egyptians between Jacob's arrival in Egypt and the crying of Israel to Yahweh. This oppression is of great importance for Dt. 26 (vv. 6,7b); is the reader meant to recall Ex. 1, with its association of the multiplication of the people with Egyptian repression?

This talk of Israel's great numbers achieves its parenetic point with the contrasting language in Dt. 28:62-63, which borrows from 1:10 and 10:22 ("numerous as the stars in heaven") and 26:5 (*mᵉṯê mᵉʿāṯ,* found only in these two OT passages; 28:62 also borrows the preposition from 26:5; cf. the parallel in 4:27) but turns the message on its head: if Israel falls under the curse, it will be left "few in number" (v. 62); Yahweh's multiplication of Israel (*rbh* hiphil) will turn into ruin and destruction (v. 63).

But that is not the end. Dt. 30:1-10 looks forward to the time *after* God's judgment. For an Israel ready to repent and return, v. 5b formulates the reversal of 28:63 (*rbh* hiphil following *yṭb* hiphil, only in these two verses), increase in the resettled land that will surpass the numbers of the past — note also the promise of fertility in 30:9a (with *yṯr* hiphil), expanded upon in v. 9b with an echo of 28:63. Here this late exilic or postexilic Dtr parenesis addresses the situation of its audience: a great nation emerging from insignificant beginnings becomes an auspicious paradigm of promise for those who have experienced God's terrible judgment.

Elsewhere the increase of Israel is an element in the repertoire of the promises incorporated into Dtr parenesis, although it is not very frequent. In addition to Dt. 30:9, five texts have *rāḇâ:* the qal appears with *ḥāyâ* in 8:1 and 30:16 and alongside *yṭb* in 6:3 (if we may follow LXX in completing the fragmentary clause in 6:3b with a promise of the land, the semantic association with the first relative clause shows that the second [*waʾᵃšer tirbûn mᵉʾōḏ,* with change of number] is secondary); the hiphil appears in 7:13 (alongside *brk* piel and referring to the ancestral *bᵉrîṯ* recalled in v. 12) and again in 13:18(17) (following *rḥm* piel and referring explicitly to the "oath of increase" sworn to Israel's ancestors). It is not by accident that this last text, unique in the legal corpus, concludes legislation concerning a town that has forsaken Yahweh and is devoted to destruction: the loss of an entire town is contrasted with the promise of increase.

Deuteronomy also contains promises of increase as well as human and animal fertility formulated without the *rbh* word group: 1:11 (*ysp* hiphil); 7:13b,14; 28:4 *(brk);* 28:11; 30:9 (*ytr* hiphil).

Dt. 8 uses a unique "dialectical" style to elaborate the notion of abundant blessings: prosperity, plentiful food, and great wealth (v. 13: 3 occurrences of *rbh*) endanger the land if they lead the people to forget Yahweh and trust mistakenly in their own power (vv. 11,14,17). The period of wandering in the wilderness with its episodes of deprivation had a pedagogical purpose: the people learned their total dependence on Yahweh (8:2-3,14-15). This text is probably addressed to a postexilic Israel — no longer (or not

yet) prosperous, but living in the deprivation of the "wilderness," which is to be understood as a "situation of testing."[110]

In the Dtr History the great numbers of the Israelites (without the element of increase) are emphasized especially in the idealized time of Solomon: in his prayer at Gibeon (which has undergone Dtr redaction), Solomon asks for an understanding mind because the people he must govern are so numerous (1 K. 3:8). Here *'am rāḇ* (plus the repeated innumerability formula) parallels *hā'ām hakkāḇēḏ hazzeh* (v. 9); cf. also Gen. 18:20; Jer. 30:19; Nah. 3:3,15-16.[111] The association of the king's wisdom with the multitude of the populace appears also in Hiram's words (Dtr) in 1 K. 5:21(7) *(hā'ām hārāḇ hazzeh)* and in LXX 2:46a (not in MT), which uses MT 4:20 (with the unique pleonasm *rabbîm . . . lārōḇ;* cf. Josh. 11:4; Jgs. 7:12b). Earlier, the rhetoric of Hushai describes all of battle-ready Israel as "like the sand by the sea for multitude" (2 S. 17:11).

Only superficially antithetical is the topos of the foreign nations that are greater or more powerful than Israel, referring to the inhabitants of the land and their eviction or destruction. The formulation is remarkably uniform: the nations are always *gôyim,* described as *g^eḏōlîm wa^aṣumîm (min)* in four texts (Dt. 4:38; 9:1; 11:23; Josh. 23:9); the object is always the qal or hiphil of *yāraš.* Unique to Dt. 7 is the association with *rabbîm* (vv. 1,17; once [v. 1] *gôyim rabbîm wa^aṣûmîm mimmekkā;* cf. also Ps. 135:10). The formulaic association of overwhelming multitudes with the indigenous nations is based on the tradition that the first inhabitants of the land were giants — in Ammon and Moab (Dt. 2:10,21: *'am gāḏôl w^erab wārām kā'^anāqîm*) as well as in Canaan (Dt. 1:28, *'am gāḏôl wārām mimmennû . . . w^egam-b^enê '^anāqîm;* 9:2, *'am gāḏôl wārām b^enê '^anāqîm*). This notion appears also in the spy tradition (Nu. 13:28ff.). Josh. 11:4 describes the military superiority of the indigenous nations in similar terms: "a great army *('am-rāḇ),* in number like the sand on the seashore, with very many horses and chariots"; Dt. 20:1 similarly speaks in general terms of the overwhelming foe *(sûs wārekeḇ 'am raḇ mimm^ekā),* whom Israel need not fear. Here we see the burden of all this talk of overwhelming superiority: Israel is forced to rely on Yahweh's aid and can rely on him.

Dt. 7 uses unique language to sound this theme with particular insistence,[112] stating a critical theological conclusion in v. 7: it was not because they were more numerous than any other nation *(lō' mērubb^eḵem mikkol-hā'ammîm)* that Yahweh chose Israel — they were in fact the fewest of all peoples *('attem ham^e'aṭ mikkol-hā'ammîm)* — but because he loved them and kept the oath he swore to their ancestors. This is not simply a historical statement: it reflects the self-image of postexilic Judah. Theologically, this passage (and 9:1ff.) is concerned not so much with the notion of "grace alone"[113] (cf. the continuation in 7:9ff.) as with the assurance that God remains loyal to the covenant in the present, even after judgment (7:9b).

---

110. Lohfink, *Ich will,* 60-63.
111. See also Kselman.
112. See above.
113. Cf. → XI, 300, in critical dialogue with a "nomistic" conception.

c. *Exilic and Postexilic Prophecy.* As we would expect, the theme of Israel's increase has a further focal point in exilic and postexilic prophecy. Here again, the word group *rbh* appears in only a portion of the relevant texts (e.g., Isa. 44:3; 48:19; 60:22; Jer. 31:27-28).

The ancestral tradition is cited (only) by Isa. 51:2: "Look to Abraham your father and to Sarah who bore you, for he was but one when I called him, but I shall bless him and make him many *(wᵉʼarbēhû).*" The sequence "call" — blessing — increase recalls Gen. 12:1ff., although our passage does not necessarily presuppose this particular text.[114] (The reading of 1QIsᵃ [*wʼprhw wʼrbhw*] echoes the Priestly Pentateuch texts.) In any event the recollection of Israel's ancestors serves as an argumentative assurance in the promise of imminent salvation (vv. 1,5: *yšʻ, ṣdq*). The miraculous multiplication of a single individual provides an encouraging paradigm for the present. This interpretation holds whether (with the ancient versions) we read the verbs in v. 2bβ as narrative forms, so that their application to the audience remains implicit, or (with the MT) we read them as modal forms, so that the narrative continuation remains implicit.

The connection of v. 2 with v. 1b — "Look to the rock from which you were hewn, and to the quarry from which you were dug" — is a crux. This much-discussed metaphor is usually connected with the ancestral figures of Abraham and Sarah.[115] But a reference to Zion has also been proposed: on the basis of the active reading of the LXX,[116] as an allusion to the water supply of Jerusalem and the Siloam tunnel,[117] or through interpretation of the passives as referring to deportation from Zion into exile.[118] In truth, the conceptual path from "rock" to "Zion" is not long;[119] following Janzen and Steck, one can also construct a mental bridge from *bôr* to v. 3aα (cf. also *mqbt* with *hnqbh* in the Siloam inscription[120]).

On the other hand, the ties with v. 2a cannot be overlooked: the strictly parallel composition, the several associative links between *maqqeḇeṯ bôr* and *śārâ tᵉḥôlelᵉḵem* (*maqqeḇeṯ — nᵉqēḇâ — ḥayil — neqeḇ — ḥll, bôr,* "woman" [Prov. 5:15ff.]), the association of *ṣûr* with "father" in Dt. 32:18a (although there it refers to God). If we also take cognizance of the central role played by "mother Zion" in the surrounding context (49:14ff.; 50:1-2; 54:1ff.), we arrive at the likely explanation that here two images have been merged. V. 1b refers in the first instance to mother Zion — possibly, if the verbs are not dependent on the rock metaphor but convey their own sense, with overtones of violent removal. But even before the transformation is described (v. 3), v. 2 conjures up a picture of the "first" ancestors (and their increase) — both a recollection and a promise. This change of perspective may have been induced by 54:1ff.: a promise addressed

114. C. Hardmeier, *WuD* 16 (1981) 31ff.
115. → VI, 319-20.
116. *Ibid.*
117. J. G. Janzen, *HAR* 10 (1986) 139-55.
118. Steck, "Zions Tröstung".
119. → VI, 317-18.
120. *KAI,* 189.1.

to the desolate city, whose children will be more *(rabbîm)* than the children of the married woman had been, shifts in vv. 3-4 to an extended tent metaphor that could easily evoke Sarah (cf. also *qārā'* in 51:2 and 54:6).

Assurance is also the goal of the reference to "Abraham, who was only one man," in Ezk. 33:24 — here, however, the gift of the land is presented as an argument of the "many" *(rabbîm),* disavowed by the prophet's description of Israel's sins. The perspective is also strikingly reversed: in Ezk. 33 the speakers are "the inhabitants of these waste places" *(yōšᵉḇê heḥᵒrāḇôṯ hā'ēlleh),* who must resign themselves to further destruction and desolation, whereas in Isa. 51:1-3 the exiles will look upon the "comforted" ruins *(ḥorḇôṯ)* of Zion.

The earliest text using *rāḇâ* in a promise of increase is probably Jer. 30:19b: "I shall make them many *(wᵉhirbiṯîm),* and they shall not be few *(wᵉlō' yim'āṭû);* I shall make them numerous *(wᵉhiḵbaḏtîm),* and they shall not be scant *(wᵉlō' yiṣārû).*" In Jeremiah's "book of consolation for Ephraim,"[121] the description of affliction and the reasons for it (30:5-7,12-15) are followed by a promise of rebuilding and new abundance in the land (30:18-21; 31:2-6). The resonance between increase *(rbh* hiphil, v. 19) and the greatness *(rōḇ,* vv. 14ff.) of Israel's guilt may well be intentional,[122] suggesting the extent of the restoration of Israel's fortunes *(šûḇ šᵉḇûṯ)* in the eyes of God.

It is conceivable that the difficult text in Isa. 9:2(3) *(hirbîṯā haggôy lō',* usually emended to *hirbîṯā haggîlâ)* was influenced by Jer. 30:19 with its notion of the increase of the populace. In any case both texts have certain elements in common (rejoicing, Jer. 30:19a/Isa. 9:2[3]; the coming of a ruler, Jer. 30:21/Isa. 9:5[6]) that would have made it easy to consider them together and — perhaps unconsciously — to assimilate them to each other.

The words of Jer. 30:19 (cf. also Bar. 2:34) have a close parallel in the letter of Jeremiah to the exiles, urging them even in a foreign land to conduct their lives with a view to the future (29:6): they are to establish families, multiply, and not decrease.[123]

The other occurrences in Jeremiah are decidedly late. Jer. 33:22 is a promise of increase for the offspring of David and for the Levites, echoing the patriarchal tradition *(rbh* hiphil); it presents a remarkable fusion of the innumerability topos with the comparison to "host" of heaven and the sands of the sea.[124]

Jer. 3:16 and 23:3, which use both *rāḇâ* and *pārâ,* recall the Priestly blessings of increase in the Pentateuch. (The only other occurrence of these two verbs together is in Ezk. 36:11, where the LXX and the context show them to be secondary.) These two verses are not independent. Instead, several elements in 3:14-18 are modeled on 23:1-8, a carefully structured redactional passage focusing on the promise of new shepherds, offspring of David. In this pericope, which concludes the oracles having to do with the

121. On its basic compass see N. Lohfink, "Der junge Jeremia als Propagandist und Poet," in P. Bogaert, ed., *Le livre de Jérémie. BETL* 54 (1981) 351-68.

122. *Ibid.,* 355.

123. On the Jeremianic core of this passage, see W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26–45. WMANT* 52 (1981), 11-12.

124. For a discussion of 33:14-26 as a whole, see Gross, 106-12, with bibliog.

royal house, vv. 1-4 and 7-8 exhibit a relationship with the D texts of Jeremiah,[125] which makes the typically "Priestly" formulation all the more surprising. It is nevertheless impossible to decide the question of dependence on the P composition,[126] since P can hardly have coined the idiom. Furthermore, 3:16-17, where many claim to hear an echo of postexilic debate — with Priestly circles? — over the role and necessity of the ark, is primarily concerned not with Genesis but with Jer. 23:3, as is shown by the unusual sequence *pārâ* — *rāḇâ,* which forms a chiasm with 23:3.[127]

In some salvation oracles of the book of Ezekiel, too, the hiphil of *rbh* appears in promises of increase, especially in ch. 36. The mountains of Israel are promised increase of population (36:10) and increase of human beings and animals (36:10-11). The description of new life in the land includes such elements as increase of grain, of the fruit of the tree and the produce of the field (36:29-30), and — in final, emphatic position — of the house of Israel, which will fill the ruined towns like "flocks of people" (*ṣō'n 'āḏām* — a unique simile). Finally, the "covenant of peace" promised climactically at the end of ch. 37 includes (according to MT) increase of the people (37:26). This element and others probably reflect the influence of Lev. 26.[128]

The third of Zechariah's night visions describes the Jerusalem of the age of salvation as a city with so large *(mērōḇ)* a population of people and animals that it must forgo encirclement by a city wall — without danger, since the very presence of God in its midst (in the sanctuary) protects it (Zec. 2:8[4]). Whether this passage reflects early postexilic debate as to whether rebuilding the sanctuary or the wall should have priority must remain an open question. In any case, increase and fertility as benefits bestowed by the restored temple (alongside its traditional protective function) signalize a fundamental (negative) aspect of life as experienced in this period (Hag. 1:3ff.).

The late exilic text Zec. 10:8 (like Jer. 3:16; 23:3; cf. the context preceding Ezk. 36:29ff.; 37:26) links the topos of gathering and restoration with the prediction of a populace as numerous as before *(wᵉrāḇû kᵉmô rāḇû).* The restoration is described expansively, probably as an idealized Israel of the Davidic and Solomonic period: even Gilead and Lebanon do not provide enough room for those returning (v. 10).

3. *Predicates of God.* Lexemes belonging to this word group (esp. *raḇ* and *rōḇ*) are the preferred means of describing the attributes or works of God as "great"; derivatives of roots like *gdl* are less common in this function.[129] Semantically, the texts can be categorized in two relatively self-contained groups. One speaks of Yahweh's might and mighty acts: the greatness of his might (*kōaḥ,* Isa. 63:1; Ps. 147:5; Job 23:6; *'ônîm,* Isa.

---

125. W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1–25. WMANT* 41 (1973), 247-48.

126. Gross, 105.

127. For a discussion of this technique see M. Weiss, *The Bible from Within* (Jerusalem, 1984), 95-96, 116.

128. Gross, 116-17; for a contrary view, see, e.g., C. Levin, *Die Verheissung des Neuen Bundes. FRLANT* 137 (1985), 216ff.

129. E. Jenni, *THAT,* I, 407.

40:26; *ʿōz,* Ps. 66:3), majesty (*gāʾôn,* Ex. 15:7), immensity (*gōd̲el,* Ps. 150:2), deeds (*ʿalîlîâ,* Jer. 32:19), and power to save (*rab̲ lᵉhôšîaʿ,* Isa. 63:1). The other comprises statements about Yahweh's goodness, compassion, and faithfulness toward Israel: he is abundant in goodness (*ṭûb,* Ps. 31:20[19]; 145:7; Isa. 63:7), mercy (*raḥᵃmîm,* Ps. 51:3[1]; 69:17[16]; 2 S. 24:14 par. 1 Ch. 21:13; Ps. 119:156; Dnl. 9:18; Neh. 9:19,27,31); cf. Sir. 3:19a; 5:6a; 16:12a), and faithfulness (*ʾᵉmûnâ,* Lam. 3:23); with him is great power to redeem (*harbēh ʿimmô pᵉd̲ûṯ* par. *ḥesed̲,* Ps. 130:7); he will abundantly pardon (*yarbeh lislôaḥ,* Isa. 55:7) and often restrains his anger (*hirbâ lᵉhāšîb̲ ʾappô,* Ps. 78:38). In this group *rab̲/rōb̲* appears most often in combination with *ḥesed̲* ("goodness, faithfulness, favor"): Ps. 5:8(7); 69:14(13); 86:15; 106:45; Lam. 3:32; Neh. 13:22; Sir. 51:3a) and in the formulaic (albeit variable) predication of God (the so-called thirteen *middôṯ* of God) in Ex. 34:6 *(ḥesed̲ weʾᵉmeṯ);* Nu. 14:18; Joel 2:13; Jon. 4:2; Ps. 86:15; 103:8; Neh. 9:17.[130] The pl. *ḥᵃsād̲îm* also appears in Isa. 63:7 and Ps. 106:7 (par. *niplᵉʾôṯ*).

All these texts emphasizing the abundance *(rbh)* of God's goodness and mercy contrast strikingly to the single text that says the same thing of God's anger: Job 10:17 *(tereb̲ kaʿaśk̲ā ʿimmād̲î).* (It is impossible to categorize *rōb̲ ṣᵉd̲āqâ* in Job 37:23.) This observation fits with the communicative purpose of this language: of the 41 occurrences listed, it is significant that 33 appear in the context of prayer (in the extended sense), most in an apostrophe addressed to God. The point at issue — in praise, lament, or prophetic oracle — is always recollection of or appeal to Yahweh's enduring favor toward Israel, despite sin and judgment.

4. *Wisdom.* Expressions using this word group take on a certain independent weight in many sapiential aphorisms, when the quantity of something is the (or a) theme. Of course, the actual subject under discussion is of paramount importance. According to the wise, for example, an abundance of counselors can only be beneficial (Prov. 11:14; 15:22; 24:6), whereas many (trivial) words are a danger (Prov. 10:19; Eccl. 5:1-2,5-6[2-3,6-7]).

The text of Eccl. 5:6a(7a), *kî bᵉrōb̲ ḥᵃlōmôṯ wahᵃb̲ālîm ûd̲ᵉb̲ārîm harbēh,* is difficult; several emendations have been proposed. Possibly, however, the MT can be read as it stands (continuing v. 5b[6b]): "Why should God be angry at your words . . . , or indeed on account of many dreams and vanities and a multitude of words?"[131] The repeated *kî* in v. 6(7), with a different meaning in each case, corresponds to the repeated *ʾal* in v. 5a(6a); the two repetitions form a frame around v. 5b(6b).

The problematic experience that riches win many friends (and poverty the opposite: Prov. 14:20; 19:4,6 [*nād̲îb̲* par. *ʾîš mattān* probably means "generous"; cf. Sir. 13:21[22]) is described bluntly by Qoheleth from the perspective of the rich: "When goods increase *(birᵉb̲ôṯ),* those who devour them increase *(rabbû);* and what gain has

---

130. For a discussion of the formula, see H. J. Stoebe, *THAT,* I, 612-13; J. Jeremias, *Die Reue Gottes. BSt* 65 (1975) 94ff. (with bibliog.).

131. See already Rashbam (*The Commentary of R. Samuel ben Meir on Qoheleth,* ed. S. Japhet and R. B. Salters [Jerusalem, 1985], *in loc.*).

their owner?" (Eccl. 5:10[11]). According to Prov. 15:16, few possessions accompanied by the fear of God is better than a great treasure *('ôṣār rāḇ)* that brings only trouble. Prov. 16:8 conveys a slightly different accent: "Better is a little with righteousness than large income *(rōḇ tᵉḇû'ōṯ)* (acquired) with injustice." According to Ps. 19:10-11(9-10), Yahweh's ordinances *(mišpāṭîm)* are more precious than "gold, even much fine gold *(paz rāḇ)*."

Many texts emphasize the great profit gained by dealing justly: in the house of the righteous there is "much treasure" (*ḥōsen rāḇ*, Prov. 15:6); keeping the *mišpāṭîm* entails "great reward" (*'ēqeḇ rāḇ*, Ps. 19:12[11]); those who love the law can expect "great peace" (*šālôm rāḇ*, Ps. 119:165); the man one can trust will be "abundant in blessings" (*raḇ-bᵉrāḵôṯ*, Prov. 28:20, in contrast to one who is in a hurry to be rich). But the reverse is also true: one who turns a blind eye to the poor will get "many a curse" (*raḇ-mᵉ'ērôṯ*, 28:27); when a land rebels it has many rulers (*rabbîm śārêhā*, 28:2); a ruler who lacks understanding is "great in oppression" (*raḇ ma'ᵃšaqqôṯ*, 28:16); a hothead causes much transgression (*raḇ-pāša'*, 29:22). Qoheleth, however, casts doubt on the profit of wisdom itself: "In much wisdom is much vexation" (*bᵉrōḇ ḥoḵmâ roḇ-kā'as*, Eccl. 1:18); he even counsels a rather detached middle course in striving for righteousness: "Do not be too righteous *('al-tᵉhî ṣaddîq harbēh)*, and do not act too wise; why should you destroy yourself? Do not be too wicked *('al-tirša' harbēh)* and do not be a fool; why should you die before your time?" (7:16-17). Traditional wisdom, by contrast, see its limits elsewhere: "The human mind may devise many plans, but it is the purpose of Yahweh that will be established" (Prov. 19:21).

Criticism of trusting[132] in one's own possessions or power is also voiced apart from the context of wisdom. Several texts using this word group fall into this category: the wicked trust in the abundance of their riches (Ps. 49:7[6]; 52:9[7]; Job 31:24). The daughters of Babylon will be unable to save themselves in spite of their many sorceries and consultations (Isa. 47:9,12,13). Sennacherib boasts arrogantly of his many chariots (2 K. 19:23 [*Q*] par. Isa. 37:24; cf. Isa. 10:13-15).

Israel, too, can fall victim to this temptation.[133] Hos. 10:13b-15, an oracle of judgment, accuses the northern kingdom of trusting in the multitude of its warriors *(rōḇ gibbôrêḵā)*. A later appendix to the story of Gideon (Jgs. 7:2-8) begins the account of Gideon's victory over Midian with a similar interpretive passage: at first the troops were too many (*raḇ*, vv. 2,4); their number had to be reduced in two stages to three hundred, "lest Israel take credit away from [Yahweh], saying, 'My own hand has delivered me'" (v. 2b). By contrast, the incalculable size of the enemy host (v. 12, "numerous as locusts [*kā'arbeh lārōḇ*], and their camels were without number, countless as the sand on the seashore"; cf. Jgs. 6:5) completes this picture of a war fought by Yahweh (cf. also 1 S. 14:6).

Ps. 33 voices the fundamental difference between divine power and human might:

---

132. → בטח *bāṭaḥ*.
133. See III.2.b above.

when facing Yahweh, the Lord of the universe, a king is not saved by his great army *(rāḇ-ḥayil)* or a warrior by his great strength (*rāḇ-kôaḥ,* v. 16); a war horse cannot save by its great might (*rōḇ ḥēlô,* v. 17).[134]

Blum

5. *Inclusive Plural.* The pl. form *rabbîm,* "many," often has the inclusive sense of "all" (< "a great multitude").[135] This is especially the case in the expression *'ammîm rabbîm,* which, e.g., parallels *kol-haggôyim* in Isa. 2:3 and Mic. 4:2 (cf. the parallels in vv. 3-4). Other examples include Isa. 52:15 (par. "kings"), Ezk. 3:6-7 (par. "house of Israel"), 27:33 (par. "kings of the earth"), and Zec. 8:22 (par. *gôyim 'ᵃṣûmîm*). We also find *gôyim rabbîm* with the same meaning, e.g., in Ezk. 38:23; 39:27 ("in the eyes of many [= all] nations"); Mic. 4:11,13; also cf. Neh. 13:26: "Among many [= all] nations there was no king like him [Solomon]." In Ps. 109:30 *rabbîm* stands by itself as a term designating the (whole) congregation (*qāhāl* [*raḇ*]). Ex. 23:2 says that a witness must not side with the great crowd (the majority).

The fourth Servant Song contains no fewer than five occurrences of *rabbîm* (Isa. 52:14,15; 53:11c,12a,12bβ), referring to the uncomprehending onlookers, who are nonetheless "justified" by the servant (cf. Dnl. 12:3). If the servant stands for the ideal Israel, then "the many" are the nations of the world.

In addition, *rabbîm* can stand for a plurality contrasted to an individual,[136] e.g., those listening to the instruction of a wisdom teacher (Prov. 10:21; Sir. 37:19 [cf. v. 23, *hā'ām*]; 39:9 [cf. v. 10, Gk. *ekklēsía*]; and possibly Job 4:3-4) or a priest (Mal. 2:6,8).

Ringgren

6. *marbîṯ/tarbîṯ.* A precise semantic investigation of *marbîṯ* and *tarbîṯ* is difficult, because it obviously depends on the contextual inclusion of the terms in a variety of textual genres. The noun *marbîṯ* stands for a great multitude, almost the totality of the entity in question. According to 1 S. 2:33, most of the house of Eli is exterminated; only a single person is spared (cf. 1 Ch. 12:30[29]; 2 Ch. 30:18). Used inclusively, *marbîṯ* stands for the greatness of Solomon's wisdom, which surpasses everything in the eyes of the Queen of Sheba (2 Ch. 9:6).

The noun *marbîṯ* occurs only once in a legal text, Lev. 25:37; there it is clearly identical in meaning with *tarbîṯ* (v. 36), which invariably parallels *nešeḵ*[137] (always in late texts except Prov. 28:8: Ezk. 18:8,13,17; 22:12). The two terms can hardly be differentiated semantically.[138] Without exception, it is clear that one takes *(lāqaḥ) tarbîṯ,* "interest" (?), whereas one provides *(nāṯan)* something *bᵉnešeḵ,* "with profit" (?). (Scholars have pro-

---

134. F. Stolz, *Kriegstheorien und Kriegserfahrungen im Glauben des alten Israel. ATANT* 60 (1972), 115-19, citing additional texts.

135. J. Jeremias, "πολλοί," *TDNT,* VI, 536ff.

136. See Wiklander.

137. → נשך *nāšaḵ.*

138. See E. Neufeld, *HUCA* 26 (1955) 355-412, esp. 356.

posed a variety of interpretations:[139] *tarbît* as the surcharge when a loan is repaid[140] or as the increase of the lent capital.[141]) The few occurrences suggest that *nešek* refers to interest on a monetary loan, *tarbît* to interest on provision of food.[142] It is also possible that the very late word *tarbît* was added as a gloss to explain the ancient word *nešek*.

IV. The Title "Rabbi." An etymological survey of Semitic reveals that *rab* was used as a title at a very early date: Old Akk. *rubûm* and *rubātum* already mean "prince" and "princess" when referring to deities and human beings.[143] The adj. *rabûm,* too, functions as a title in combination with terms denoting occupations: it may refer, e.g., to a supervisor of craftsmen, a commandant, or a presiding judge.[144] Ugaritic and Arabic exhibit similar usage.

At Ugarit *rab* appears as an element in the titles of secular functionaries, but it also denotes the "chief priest": *rb khnm/rb ntbtš;*[145] cf. also *rb qrt*[146] and *rb nqdm, rb spr.*[147]

This title, with the meaning "commander," came to be used quite extensively in Aramaic,[148] Syriac,[149] Phoenician and Punic, Nabatean, and Palmyrene. The association system, which played an increasingly large and important role in these cultures, used the title *rab* for the chief functionary of the various associations, with authority appropriate to his office.[150] The title is therefore common in dedicatory inscriptions, since, as a rule, the *rab* presided personally over the dedication ceremony as representative of his (cultic) association.

The use of *rab* in OT titles is very common.[151] The term always implies the hierarchical superiority of the person bearing the title;[152] this superiority is especially clear, e.g., in the Samaritans' use of the title "Rabbi" for God.[153] When early rabbinic literature contrasts the *rab* to the *talmîd,* "pupil, disciple," the shift of meaning to "teacher" is significant. The title *rabbî* was thus originally an honorific style of address implying a certain relationship. In the Aramaic of the NT period, this semantic element is not always visible; here the suffix added to the title seems to have lost its pronominal force.[154] From

---

139. See further A. Cholewiński, *Heiligkeitsgesetz und Deuteronomium. AnBibl* 66 (1976), 229 n. 49; also → X, 64-65.

140. Neufeld, *HUCA* 26 (1955) 355-412.

141. H. W. Weil, *AHDO* 2 (1938), 205.

142. M. Noth, *Leviticus. OTL* (Eng. trans. ²1977), 191; Cholewiński, *Heiligkeitsgesetz.*

143. *AHw,* II, 992.

144. *AHw,* II, 938.

145. Shanks, 153.

146. *KTU,* 4.141, III, 3.

147. *WUS,* no. 2481.

148. *BMAP,* 226-27, 317.

149. *CSD,* 525.

150. → מרזח *marzēaḥ.*

151. See above.

152. E. Lohse, "ῥαββί," *TDNT,* VI, 961ff.

153. G. Dalman, *The Words of Jesus* (Eng. trans. Edinburgh, 1909), 331-36, esp. 334-35; Tg. also uses *ribbôn* in this sense.

154. F. Hahn, *Christologische Hoheitstitel. FRLANT* 83 (³1966), 78.

the parallel term *rabbān,* Palestinian Aramaic developed the suffixed title *rabbûnî* (Mark 10:51; John 20:16).[155] The evangelists usually correctly represent the appellatives *rabbî* and *rabbûnî* with *didáskalē,* even though the LXX never offers precisely this translation.[156]

V. 1. *LXX.* The LXX regularly uses *polýs/pleíōn/pleístos* to translate our word group (more than 400 times). Almost as frequent is the noun *plē̃thos* and the corresponding verb *plēthýnein,* "multiply" (also representing *rāḇâ* qal); in third place comes *mégas* (with one occurrence of *megalýnein*). The subst. *marbeh* is represented by *mégas; marbîṯ* and *tarbîṯ* can be translated by *pleonasmós, ribbô(')* by *myriás,* and *tarbûṯ* by *sýstremma.* Usually *'arbeh* is translated by *akrís.* Finally, *reḇîḇîm* is represented by *stagṓn* and *niphetós,* but once exceptionally by *klēsmonḗ,* "surfeit."

2. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* Our word group appears frequently in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The verb *rāḇâ* occurs some 50 times, with a clear concentration in prayers (1QH). The adj. *raḇ,* with some 150 occurrences, is the most common representative of the group, most frequently in the rules governing the community; in 1QS (and similarly CD) it appears exclusively in the pl. *rabbîm.* There are about 110 occurrences of the noun *raḇ/rôḇ,* especially frequent in prayers (1QH and 11QPs[a]). Its occurrences in the rules are semantically similar to the term *rabbîm.* Finally, *rbw'* occurs 4 times (1QM 3:16; 4:16; 12:4; 13:4) and *rbybym* 3 (1QM 12:10; 19:2; 1Q34 1:3). The semantic range corresponds by and large to that found in the OT.

a. *Theological Usage.* It is probably due to the unique character of the Dead Sea Scrolls that our word group almost never appears in secular contexts. Even there, certain theological perspectives are implicit: it is typical of the deceptive illusion presented by this world that those at home in it, with their wealth and possessions, resemble a verdant tree bearing "many branches" (*rbh 'np,* 1QH 10:26), that they boast of their abundance *(rôḇ)* of grain, wine, and oil (10:24). The Copper Scroll speaks of an "abundance of silver" (3Q15 9:10); the Temple Scroll speaks in similar terms in a passage echoing the Dtn law governing the king (Dt. 17:14-20; cf. 11QT 56:16-19; CD 5:2). Totally indefinite is the stereotyped formula *bên rôḇ lemû'āṭ,* "be it much, be it little" (e.g., 1QS 4:16; 1QSa 1:18).

The magnitude of a military force (e.g., "a great army") is the subject of 1QpHab 4:7; 4QpNah 1:10 (cf. Nah. 2:14[13]); 11QT 58:6-7; 61:13. A king who adheres faithfully to the law can rule for "many days" (*rabbîm yāmîm,* 11QT 59:21). The phrase *berôḇ yāmîm,* "fulness of days," stands for the coming of the eschaton (1QH 17:15). The "multitude of a man's years" is a reason to entrust him with different tasks within the community, commensurate with his strength (1QSa 1:19). The expression *p'mym rbwt,* "many times," clearly has the semantic connotation "forever" (1QM 11:3; 18:7; esp. 11QPs[a] 22:12: "I think of you forever, O Zion").

155. G. Schneider, "ῥαββί," *EDNT,* III, 205-6; H. P. Rüger, *TRE,* III, 608.
156. K. H. Rengstorf, "διδάσκω," *TDNT,* II, 135-38, 148-51.

The actual quantity is indefinite when the text speaks of "many" *(rabbîm, rabbôṯ):* many nations, cities, lands, etc. (often clearly suggesting the civilized world outside the Qumran community) are led astray (1QpHab 10:9,11; 1QH 2:27; CD 2:16; 4QpNah 2:8), overthrown (1QpHab 6:8,10; 1QSb 3:18), destroyed (1QpHab 2:13; 4Q381 46:7; 4QpPs37 3:3), and made objects of scorn (1QpHab 4:2-3). Belief in Israel's divine election entails the self-understanding of being "now one people out of many peoples and great nations" (4Q381 76-77, 15) and a sense of being "in the midst of many peoples" (1QpHab 10:4).

b. *Anthropological Contexts.* The word group appears frequently in anthropological contexts. The Essene psalmist feels oppressed by "many sins" (1QH 3:25; 1QH fr. 6:12; 4Q381 33, 4,9) but at the same time confident of God's forgiveness and purification (1QH 1:32; 3:21). God makes the psalmist great (1QH 16:4), multiplies his inheritance (1QH 10:28; 11QT 55:12), and lengthens his life (4Q505 24, 3 [text?]). The psalmist knows that he lives in a world of "great wickedness" *(rb ḥnp),* fury, deceit, lies, and "folly beyond measure" (1QS 4:10-11). But all will be judged according to the "multitude of their sins" (*rb pšʿ,* 1QH 4:19). A wicked way of life brings a "glut of punishments" (*rb ngyʿym,* 1QS 4:12), whereas a good way life brings "plentiful peace" (*rb šlwm,* 1QS 4:7).

c. *Mythological Motifs.* In describing human suffering and oppression, the psalmist occasionally draws on mythological motifs: his enemies oppress him like the din of "mighty waters" (1QH 2:16,27). In unpublished texts we also find the expression *ḥšk rb,* "(the) great darkness." The psalmist applies to the Creator the cosmic image of "many waters": "Great and holy is the Lord. . . . Before him goes glory and behind him goes the din of many waters" (11QPs[a] 26:10). Contrariwise, we also find the notion that the pernicious influence of Belial works its way to the "great abyss" (*thwm rbh,* 1QH 3:32; 4QDibHam[a] 7:8 [text?]). A wisdom motif from the Job tradition appears in 4Q511 30, 4, asking: "What mortal's hand is able to measure the many waters?" In CD 3:16 the image of multitudinous waters appears also in connection with the ecclesiologically interesting image of well diggers who find plentiful water, a metaphor for the abundance of the *tôrâ.* From the *tôrâ* pours forth knowledge "as plentiful as the water of the sea" (1QpHab 11:2).

d. *Divine Attributes.* The word group is especially common in attributes of God: God is characterized by great glory (*kāḇôḏ,* 4Qtanḥ. 8-11, 13; 11QPs[a] 22:4), abundant truth (1QH 11:29), mercy (1QH 12:14; 4QDibHam[a] 2:10; 4Q511 52-59, 3:1), and acts of loving-kindness (1QH 4:32; 11:28; 4Q381 45, 2), by great goodness (1QS 11:4; 1QH 7:30; 11:6; 14:17; 1QH fr. 15:7 [text?]), mercy (1QH 7:18,27; 10:16; 13:17; 18:14; 11QPs[a] 19:5,11; 4Q504 22-23, 2), and forgiveness (CD 2:4; 1QH 6:9; 9:34; 11:9). God is "great in counsel and abounding in deeds" (1QH 16:8; 11QPs[a] 18:4), abounding in power (1Q29 4:2; 1QH 9:14). God does a wealth of wonders (1QH 14:23). These divine attributes, extolled again and again, demand similar conduct on the part of the community members, who must show each other great mercy, grace, and compassion (1QS 4:3ff.). Against the background of this catalog of virtues, the psalmist's description of himself in 11QPs[a] 18:19 seems strange: "I glorify the Most High . . . as one who makes the altar greasy with many burnt offerings" (= Ps. 154:11; surely a relic antedating the Qumran community).

e. *Plural.* The use of the pl. *rabbîm* in the community rules clearly deserves attention. We have already noted several times that the sense "much, many," can shift to "all, entire"; this is clearly the case when *rabbîm* has ecclesiological force.[157] Already in the OT we see how the meaning of the term changes from "many" through "most, the majority" (1 K. 18:25) to "all" (Ps. 108). Examination of Deutero-Isaiah's use of *rabbîm* presents insurmountable difficulties (see above).

Already in 1QpHab 4:2 (before 100 B.C.E.?), *rabbîm* denotes a leadership group of the Qumran community; this usage reflects that found in rabbinic literature, where *rabbîm* appears as a synonym of *ḥᵃḇērîm,* "members of a religious association." Neither etymology nor OT usage (except for possible echoes in Dnl. 11:33; 12:3) can elucidate the development of this technical meaning. An adequate translation is therefore highly dubious.[158] Only the occurrences in the texts of the community rule, taken in context, furnish usable evidence.

The manual governing the deliberations of the full members of the community (1QS 6ff.) provides a "rule for the sessions of the *rabbîm*" (6:8; cf. CD 14:12). The priests, the elders, and "the remainder of all the people" participate in these sessions (1QS 6:8-9). This rule presumes a strict hierarchical organization of the community:[159] its members enjoy precisely delimited rights based on their status, which depends on the length of time they have been members. The leader of the community is the "Inspector" *(mᵉḇaqqēr),* who is "at the head of the *rabbîm*" (6:14; cf. 6:12) and exercises supervision (CD 14:7). His job of guarding the resources of the *rabbîm* (1QS 6:20) makes clear that the word *rabbîm* must denote the core of the community, its full members. This interpretation is also suggested by the regulations governing the stages by which postulants and novices advance to the "purity of the *rabbîm*" (6:17,21; 9:2; CD 15:8), as well as those governing excommunication and the stages by which an erring member of the community is reconciled and reintegrated (1QS 6:25; 7:3,10,13,16,19). Decisions in these matters are reached by the *rabbîm,* who therefore represent the integral core of the community (6:9,15,16), which has reserved to itself full and total authority over the community's common property (6:17,20; 7:25). The identity of the *rabbîm* is reinforced by such expressions as "the purity of the *rabbîm*" (see above), "the drink of the *rabbîm*" (7:20), and "the property of the *rabbîm*" (see above).

The Teacher of Righteousness boasts of his achievements with the *rabbîm:* he has enlightened their eyes and made them see God's wonders (1QH 4:27-28; cf. 1QSb 4:27).

Finally, the expressions used in parallel with *rabbîm* in these texts are revealing: *rôḇ 'anšê habbᵉrîṯ,* "the multitude of the men of the covenant" (1QS 5:2,9; 6:19); *rôḇ yiśrā'ēl,* "the multitude of Israel" (5:22); and *rôḇ qᵉḏôšîm,* "the multitude of the holy ones" (1QM 12:1).

---

157. One of the first thorough studies of this terminology is E. Koffmahn, "Die Selbstbezeichnungen der Gemeinde von Qumran auf dem Hintergrunde des ATs" (diss., Vienna, 1959), 25-24.

158. See already H. W. Huppenbauer, *Der Mensch Zwischen zwei Welten* (Zurich, 1959).

159. → יחד *yāḥaḏ.*

The term thus conveys a personal sense; at the same time, it is clear that *rabbîm* cannot be reduced to a term denoting size or quantity, but entails a theological and ecclesiological valence. There is no evidence to support an association, commonly cited in discussions of this usage,[160] with the use of the title "Rabbi" for a teacher and scribe, since it is not clear when the title takes on this valence (see above). It is unlikely, furthermore, that the members of the community considered themselves scribes, especially since they had examples of such competencies in their *maśkîl* and *mᵉḇaqqēr.* We must therefore be content with the conclusion that the precise valence of the term can no longer be determined.

Fabry

160. Already suggested by M. Burrows and repeated by Carmignac, 584.

רָבַץ *rāḇaṣ;* מַרְבֵּץ *marbēṣ;* רֵבֶץ *rēḇeṣ*

I. Other Semitic Languages. II. 1. OT Occurrences; 2. Meaning and Lexical Field; 3. LXX. III. OT Usage: 1. Animals; 2. Figurative Usage; 3. Mythological Background.

I. Other Semitic Languages. The root *rbṣ* is Common Semitic. It is attested especially well in Akkadian, where, in addition to the verb *rabāṣu(m),* "lie down," we find the derivatives *rabṣu, rubṣu, rābiṣu/rābiṣūtu, narbāṣu, rubbuṣum,* and *tarbaṣu.*[1]

In Ugaritic we find the noun *trbṣ,* "fold, corral."[2] The verb appears in the expression *wrbṣ lǵrk inbb,*[3] albeit here the meaning "lie down" is not entirely certain.[4] Unclear are the proper noun *irbṣ*[5] and the form]*rbṣ,* almost certainly fragmentary.[6]

The root also appears in Aramaic (*rᵉḇaʿ,* "lie down") and Arabic (*rabaḍa,* "lie down"; *marbiḍ,* "fold").[7]

rāḇaṣ. G. R. Castellino, "Genesis IV 7," *VT* 10 (1960) 442-45; L. Ramaroson, "A propos de Gn 4,7," *Bibl* 49 (1968) 233-37; H.-J. Zobel, *Stammesspruch und Geschichte. BZAW* 95 (1965).

1. *AHw,* II, 933-34.
2. *KTU,* 1.14, II, 3; III, 25, 37; VI, 8, 21; cf. *WUS,* no. 2487; *UT,* no. 2304.
3. *KTU,* 1.13, 9.
4. *WUS,* no. 2487.
5. *KTU,* 4.122, 1; cf. *WUS,* no. 381.
6. *KTU,* 4.382, 4; cf. *UT,* no. 2304.
7. Wehr, 321.

II. 1. *OT Occurrences.* In the OT the verb occurs 24 times in the qal (perf., imperf., and ptcp.) and 6 times in the hiphil (imperf. and ptcp.). The noun occurs 4 times in the form *rēḇeṣ* and twice in the form *marbēṣ* with the const. *mirbaṣ*.[8]

These occurrences, 36 in all, are distributed as follows: the qal occurs 6 times in Isaiah, 5 times in Genesis, 3 times each in Deuteronomy, Ezekiel, and Zephaniah, and once each in Exodus, Numbers, Psalms, and Job. The hiphil occurs twice in Isaiah and once each in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Psalms, and Song of Songs. The noun *rēḇeṣ* occurs twice in Isaiah and once each in Jeremiah and Proverbs; *marbēṣ* occurs in Ezk. 25:5 and Zeph. 2:15. The corresponding Aramaic form *rb'* is represented in the OT by the qal infinitive construct (Lev. 18:23; 20:16; Ps. 139:3) and the hiphil imperfective (Lev. 19:19).

In Gen. 4:7 exegetes frequently reconcile the tension between the fem. subj. *ḥaṭṭā't* and the masc. predicate *rōḇēṣ* by emending the text to read *ḥēṭ' tirbaṣ* or the like.[9] Despite all the other problems raised by this verse,[10] emendation is unnecessary, since *rōḇēṣ* can be understood as a nominalized participle.[11] By contrast, the suffixed noun *riḇṣâ* in Isa. 35:7 should be read as the verbal form *rāḇᵉṣâ*.[12]

2. *Meaning and Lexical Field.* In the qal the verb has the basic meaning "lie down," in the hiphil, "cause to lie down." The majority of its occurrences suggest that in the background stands the notion of animals at rest.[13] This meaning is underscored by the nouns *rēḇeṣ* and *marbēṣ,* which as a rule refer to "resting place" or "fold" for animals, often appearing in parallel with *nāweh,* "pasture" (e.g., Isa. 65:10; Ezk. 25:5). The same meaning emerges from the broader lexical field. With the verb in the qal, animals are the subject 17 times (including Isa. 35:7). With the verb in the hiphil, the subjects are shepherds who make their flocks lie down (Isa. 13:20; Jer. 33:12; Ezk. 34:15; Ps. 23:1-2).

Even when the verb is used metaphorically to describe human behavior, the lexical field for the most part preserves the original image (Gen. 49:9,14; Isa. 14:30; Ezk. 19:2; 29:3; 34:14-15; Ps. 23:1-2).

The immediate lexical field of *rbṣ* therefore includes the "herd" (→ עדר *'ēḏer,* Gen. 29:2; Isa. 17:2; Zeph. 2:14), the "flock" (→ צאן *ṣō'n,* Gen. 29:2; Jer. 33:12; Ezk. 34:14-15; Cant. 1:7-8), and the "shepherd" (*rō'eh,* Isa. 13:20; Jer. 33:12; etc.). By far the most frequent parallel to *rbṣ* is the verb → רעה *rā'â,* "graze" (Isa. 11:7; 14:30; 27:10; Ezk. 34:14-15; Zeph. 2:7; 3:13; Cant. 1:7); occasionally we find *kr',* "crouch" (Gen. 49:9), *'sp,* "assemble" (Ps. 104:22), and *gûr,* "lie down as a guest" (Isa. 11:6).

The different ways in which animals lie down to rest can be expressed by various prepositions or prepositional phrases, such as *'al* (Gen. 29:2; Dt. 22:6), *'im* (Isa. 11:6),

8. Meyer, §§27.3; 49.3a.

9. O. Procksch, *Genesis. KAT* I (^{2,3}1924), 47; G. von Rad, *Genesis. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1961), 101-2.

10. See below.

11. *GK,* §145u; cf. C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1984), 299-300.

12. O. Kaiser, *Das Buch des Propheten Jesaja. ATD* XVIII (1983), 286.

13. *AuS,* VI, 261.

bên (Gen. 49:14; Ezk. 19:2), *taḥaṯ* (Ex. 23:5; Nu. 22:27), or *bᵉṯôḵ* (Ezk. 29:3; Zeph. 2:14).

Since the image of flock and shepherd often stands for the relationship of Israel and Yahweh, the direct subject of the qal can be an individual or a group (*'eḇyôn,* Isa. 14:30; *šᵉ'ērîṯ,* Zeph. 2:7), and Yahweh can be the direct subject of the hiphil (Ezk. 34:14-15; Ps. 23:1-2).

We seem to have left this pastoral context behind when the subject is "the deep" (*tᵉhôm,* Gen. 49:25; Dt. 33:13), "sin" (*ḥaṭṭā'ṯ,* Gen. 4:7), or a "curse" (*'ālâ,* Dt. 29:19 [Eng. 20]). The unique usage of the hiphil in Isa. 54:11 displays a marked semantic shift: "I [Yahweh] am about to set *(marbîṣ)* your stones in antimony."[14]

Except in Ps. 139:3, the Aramaic form of the verb *(rb')* is used exclusively for prohibited sexual intercourse (Lev. 18:23; 19:19; 20:16). The Dead Sea Scrolls attest only one occurrence to date (11QT 65:3 = Dt. 22:6).[15]

3. *LXX.* The nuanced semantics of the verb *rbṣ* are reflected in the LXX translation, which most often uses *anapaúein* (9 times) or *synanapaúesthai* (once) to translate it. Almost synonymous are *koitázesthai* (4 times), *hēsycházein, koimán* (twice each), and *kataskēnoun* (once).

In addition the LXX renders *rbṣ* contextually: *némein* (twice), *anapíptein, bóskein, enkathḗsthai, etoimázein, thálpein, kollán, píptein,* and *synkathízein* (once each). To these may be added even freer periphrastic translations using *échein* and *gínesthai* (once each). The LXX uses the nouns *anápausis* and *koítē* once each to translate the verb *rbṣ;* elsewhere they represent *rēḇeṣ.* The noun *marbēṣ* is represented by *nomḗ.*

III. OT Usage. For our analysis of OT usage it is safe to start with the observation that, in the majority of its occurrences, the root *rbṣ* expresses the resting posture of animals.[16] In the metaphor of flock and people, shepherd and God, this meaning can be extended to describe human behavior. Demonic mythological notions originally associated with the realm of animals and gods among Israel's neighbors may account for the OT use of the root *rbṣ* in connection with the "deep" (Gen. 49:25; Dt. 33:13), "sin" (Gen. 4:7), or a "curse" (Dt. 29:19[20]). However, neither this hypothesis nor the actual texts and their distribution permit us to draw any conclusions concerning a semantic development of the root *rbṣ* within the OT itself. On the whole, OT usage corresponds to that of the Akkadian verb *rabāṣu(m),* which is used of animals, persons, demons, and gods.[17]

1. *Animals.* a. The lying down of animals to rest is associated closely with grazing. For example, the lover asks his beloved: "Where do you pasture your flock? Where do you make it lie down (*rbṣ* hiphil) at noon?" (Cant. 1:7). When Jacob comes to Laban,

---

14. C. Westermann, *Jesaja. ATD* XIX (^{2}1986), 222-23.
15. See III.1.b below.
16. See II.2 above.
17. *AHw,* II, 933-34.

he sees a well in the field, "by which three flocks of sheep were lying (*rbṣ* qal)" (Gen. 29:2) — in other words, the flocks were returning from grazing and were waiting to be watered.

To the alternation of grazing and resting typical of domestic animals corresponds alternation of hunting and resting on the part of beasts of prey. "The young lions roar for their prey. . . . When the sun rises, they withdraw and lie down (*rbṣ* qal) in their dens" (Ps. 104:21-22). On the other hand, beasts of burden can collapse under their load, "lying (*rbṣ* qal) under their burden." A law stipulates that in such circumstances even an animal belonging to an enemy must be helped (Ex. 23:5). The donkey "lies down (*rbṣ* qal) between the saddlebaskets *(bên hammišpᵉṯāyim)*" (Gen. 49:14), an example of its fractious behavior.[18] If, however, *hammišpᵉṯāyim* is translated "forked pens,"[19] then the donkey lies down in an open corral. Balaam's donkey lies down *(rbṣ)* when she sees that the road is barred by the *mal'aḵ yhwh* (Nu. 22:27).

b. Animals of different species lie down in different places. The resting places *(marbēṣ, rēḇeṣ)* of sheep and goats are the field (*śāḏeh,* Gen. 29:2) and the meadow or pasture (*nāweh,* Isa. 65:10; Jer. 33:12; Ezk. 25:5; 34:14; cf. Ps. 23:2). Wild animals have their lairs in the wilderness (*miḏbār,* Isa. 27:10; *šammâ,* Zeph. 2:15; cf. Isa. 35:7). When Dt. 22:6 says that the mother bird *('ēm)* sits (*rbṣ* qal) upon her fledglings or eggs, the text describes a mode of protective behavior appropriate to birds. Safety and security are absolutely necessary for resting animals. Beasts of prey withdraw into their caves at daybreak (Ps. 104:22); the lioness lies down among young lions (Ezk. 19:2) and the crocodile in the midst of the channels of the Nile (29:3).

The shepherd is responsible for seeing to it that the flock "lies down in safety" (*lāḇeṭaḥ yirbāṣû,* Isa. 14:30), and only in places where the animals will be undisturbed: "They lie down and no one startles them" (*wᵉ'ên maḥᵃrîḏ,* Isa. 17:2; Zeph. 3:13; cf. Job 11:19).

2. *Figurative Usage.* The prophets did not restrict their use of the image of grazing and resting animals to its figurative usage as a metaphor for human life; even in its literal sense, it can symbolize in many contexts the bane or blessing of the land. Flocks (*'ᵃḏārîm,* Isa. 17:2) or calves (*'ēḡel,* 27:10) lie down on depopulated ruins; such a site is like the wilderness, a "lair for wild animals" (*marbēṣ laḥayyâ,* Zeph. 2:15). As another way of describing catastrophe, we find the statement: "Shepherds will not make their flocks lie down (*rbṣ* hiphil) there," but instead demons *(ṣîyîm)*[20] will lie down (*rbṣ* qal) there along with other wild animals of the wilderness, which lies between the animal world and the realm of demons (Isa. 13:20-21).[21]

How closely bane and blessing converge in these images is illustrated by two passages in which the message depends entirely on the context. A prophetic oracle threatens: "I will make Rabbah a pasture *(nāweh)* for camels and Ammon a fold for

---

18. *HAL,* II, 652.

19. O. Eissfeldt, *KlSchr,* III (1966), 61-66; Zobel, 16; cf. NRSV.

20. → צִי *ṣî; KBL²,* 801.

21. Kaiser, *ATD* XVIII, 20; H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1997), 10, 30-31.

flocks *(mirbaṣ ṣō'n)*" (Ezk. 25:5). Contrariwise, Isa. 65:10 uses almost the identical words to promise deliverance: "Sharon will become a pasture *(nāweh)* for flocks *(ṣō'n),* and the valley of Achor a resting place *(rēḇeṣ)* for herds." And the image that describes the place that is waste as being "once more a pasture *(nāweh)* for shepherds where they can rest (*rbṣ* hiphil) their flocks *(ṣō'n)*" promises future restoration (Jer. 33:12).

Finally, the image of the irrigated desert as "in the place where jackals lay [reading *rāḇᵉṣâ*][22] reeds and rushes will flourish" (Isa. 35:7) represents salvation, as does the notion of the "peaceable kingdom" in 11:6-7, in which "the leopard shall lie down (*rbṣ* qal) with the kid," and the young of the cow and the bear "shall lie down together" *(yaḥdāw yirbᵉṣû).*

When the image of lying down is transferred to individuals or the nation, the OT makes use of its full semantic range.[23] In the Blessing of Jacob (Gen. 49), Judah is compared to a crouching, recumbent (*rbṣ* qal) "lion" (v. 9) and Issachar to a "bony [= strong] donkey" lying down (v. 14).[24] The "lioness" lying down among young lions (Ezk. 19:2) symbolizes the queen mother in Jerusalem; the "crocodile" lying among the channels of the Nile (29:3) stands for the pharaoh of Egypt. Most often, the image is used to describe Israel's luxurious, secure, protected way of life. This usage appears already in a retrospective vision within a series of salvation oracles (Jer. 50:6): "My people have been lost sheep . . ., from mountain to hill they have gone, they have forgotten their fold *(rēḇeṣ).*" It is Yahweh himself who will feed them "with good pasture" *(bᵉnāweh ṭôḇ)* and make them lie down (*rbṣ* hiphil) (Ezk. 34:14-15). Here too belong several passages in oracles against the nations: Zeph. 2:7 promises the "remnant" *(šᵉ'ērîṯ)* of Judah that they shall pasture and lie down (*rbṣ* qal) in a hostile land; Isa. 14:30 promises the "lowliest of the lowly" *(bᵉḵôrê ḏallîm)*[25] and the "poor" *('eḇyônîm)* that "they will lie down in safety" on Zion (cf. v. 32), Yahweh's holy mountain (see the similar statement about the "remnant" of Israel in Zeph. 3:12-13).

In Ps. 23:1 the psalmist draws on this image, affirming: "Yahweh is my shepherd, I shall not want; he makes me lie down *(yarbîṣēnî)* in green pastures *(bin'ôṯ deše')*."

The same image appears in wisdom literature, when the wicked listener is admonished: "Do not lie in wait . . . against the home of the righteous *(linwēh ṣaddîq),* do no violence to their habitation *(rēḇeṣ)*" (Prov. 24:15), or when Job's friends remind him of his trust in God (Job 11:18-19). Here the words "you will lie down, and no one will make you afraid" (v. 19; cf. Isa. 17:2; Zeph. 3:13) could be a gloss expanding on v. 18: "You will have confidence, because there is hope, 'ashamed'[26] you will take your rest in safety."[27]

---

22. See II.1 above.
23. → IX, 280ff.
24. See III.1 above; also Zobel, 12, 16-17.
25. For textual criticism and discussion see Kaiser, *ATD* XVIII, 43.
26. Reading *ḥuppartā;* cf. *BHS.*
27. G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (²1989), 222.

3. *Mythological Background.* That the use of the root *rbṣ* in some OT texts reflects an originally mythological background is already indicated by such a passage as Isa. 13:20-21.[28] Other texts in this category include Gen. 4:7; 49:25 par. Dt. 33:13; and Dt. 29:19(20).

a. *Gen. 4:7.* According to Procksch, Gen. 4:7 is "the most obscure verse in the chapter, indeed in the whole book of Genesis."[29] To date there has been no satisfactory explanation of vv. 6-7; the interpretations of *rōḇēṣ* in this context are correspondingly both complex and vague.[30] Most exegetes agree that here *rōḇēṣ* is connected with Akk. *rābiṣum,* which denotes a demon. On this explanation, "sin" *(ḥaṭṭā'ṯ)* should be pictured as a demon lurking at the door.[31] Westermann, however, doubts that "such a personification or demonization of sin is conceivable in so early a text." He therefore suggests that "in the text that has been overlaid by vv. 6-7, Cain was warned by the shade of his slain brother that he would pursue him." Later redaction expunged and transformed this notion by making "sin" the subject.[32]

b. *Dt. 29:19(20).* An original personification or demonization appears also to lie behind Dt. 29:19(20): "And every curse *(kol hā'ālâ)* will lie in wait for him *(weṛāḇeṣâ bô).*" Here, however, the original vivid image has faded and been replaced: the text now speaks of the curse "written in this book," and it is Yahweh who imposes its sanctions.[33]

c. *Gen. 49:25 par. Dt. 33:13.* Behind Gen. 49:25 par. Dt. 33:13 one can recognize the notion of the "deep" *(tehôm)* associated with the mythology of creation.[34] In contrast to Gen. 1:2 and 8:2 (P), where the deep is envisioned simply as a subterranean sea, here it is "personified mythologically"[35] and pictured as "lying beneath" *(rōḇeṣeṯ tāḥaṯ).* Strictly speaking, of course, its waters, like the waters of the heavens, are among the blessings of Yahweh.

Waschke

28. See III.2.a above.
29. O. Procksch, *KAT* I^2, 47.
30. For a summary see Westermann, *Genesis 1–11,* 299.
31. → IV, 312.
32. *Genesis 1–11,* 299.
33. C. A. Keller, *THAT,* I, 151.
34. On the relationship between these two texts, see C. Westermann, *Genesis 37–50* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1986), 240; Zobel, 37.
35. Von Rad, *Genesis,* 423; for a different view see Westermann, *Genesis 1–11,* 105-6; W. H. Schmidt, *Die Schöpfungsgeschichte der Priesterschrift. WMANT* 17 (^{2}1967), 81; but cf. Ps. 77:17(16) and Hab. 3:10.

רָגַז *rāgaz;* רֹגֶז *rōgez;* רָגְזָה *rogzâ;* רַגָּז *raggāz;* אַרְגַּז *'argaz*

I. 1. Forms; 2. Etymology; 3. Ancient Versions. II. 1. Usage; 2. Lexical Fields; 3. Meaning.

I. 1. *Forms.* We find *rgz* primarily in OT poetry. The qal occurs 31 times (including Sir. 34:24 [LXX 31:24]; the texts of Gen. 45:24 [hithpael?] and Ezk. 16:43 [hiphil?] are uncertain), the hiphil 7 times (uncertain: Isa. 13:13 [qal?]), the Aramaic haphel once (Ezr. 5:12), the hithpael 4 times, the noun *rōgez* 8 times (including Sir. 5:6), *rogzâ* once, Aram. *r^egaz* once (Dnl. 3:13), and the adj. *raggāz* once (Dt. 28:65). The qal of *rgz* is a conjectural reading in Isa. 52:15.[1]

The noun *'argaz,* found only in 1 S. 6:8,11,15, is of uncertain etymology (Philistine?), form (*'aqṭal* or *'aqṭāl?* initial syllable prothetic?),[2] and meaning ("pouch," "box," "saddlebag"?); its difficulty is already reflected in the ancient versions.[3] Indeed, this noun is probably not associated with the root *rgz* under discussion here.[4]

2. *Etymology.* Outside Hebrew,[5] the root *rgz* expressing a "motion" is found in Arabic (*rağaza* V and VIII, of thunder; *rağaz,* a tremor that afflicts camels),[6] Aramaic, Yaudic, Phoenician, Punic,[7] and Syriac.[8] Except for Arabic and Hebrew, the lexicons suggest the meaning "be angry" as the most important semantic effect (alongside "perplex, irritate," in the causative stem). If one wishes to posit a common semantic core for *rgz* in the Semitic languages, "tremble" is a reasonable starting point. The root takes on a narrower sense by synecdoche or metonymy, especially in Aramaic.[9] Students of etymology have long observed that roots with the consonant pair *rg* "express the meaning 'be or make

---

rāgaz. J. Becker, *Gottesfurcht im AT. AnBibl* 25 (1965); L. Derousseaux, *La crainte de Dieu dans l'AT. LD* 63 (1970); J. Jeremias, *Theophanie. WMANT* 10 (²1977); P. Joüon, "*Crainte* et *peur* en hébreu biblique," *Bibl* 6 (1925) 174-79; T. Nöldeke, "Wörter mit Gegensinn (Aḍdād)," in idem, *NBSS,* 67-108; H. Ringgren, "Einige Schilderungen des göttlichen Zorns," *Tradition und Situation. FS A. Weiser* (Göttingen, 1963), 107-13; F. Stolz, *Jahwes und Israels Kriege. ATANT* 60 (1972).

1. C. Westermann, *Jesaja. ATD* XIX (²1981), 204; but cf. D. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'AT. OBO* 50/2 (1986), 384-95.
2. *NSS,* 223; *VG,* I, 215.
3. See the discussion, with bibliog., in H. J. Stoebe, *Erste Buch Samuels. KAT* VIII/1 (1993), 147; P. K. McCarter, *1 Samuel. AB* VIII (1980), 130, 135; also W. H. Bennett, *ExpT* 13 (1901/1902) 234.
4. See already J. Furst, *Hebräisches und chaldäisches Handwörterbuch,* II (Leipzig, ²1863), 352.
5. For Middle Hebrew see *ANH,* 397.
6. G. W. F. Freytag, *Lexicon arabico-latinum* (Halle, 1837), II, 124.
7. *DISO,* 274; *KAI,* 9A.5; 12.4,6,7; 214.23,26; Beyer, 691-92; 1Q.20.1 1:1,2 (*DJD,* I, 86); M.-J. Fuentes Estañol, *Vocabulario fenicio. BiOr* 42 (1980), 226.
8. *LexSyr,* 711.
9. See II.3 below.

agitated.'"[10] Gesenius already extended this observation to the consonant pairs *rh* and *r'* and identified parallels in the Indo-European languages, e.g., Gk. *orgḗ*.[11]

3. *Ancient Versions.* While Tg. and Syr. for the most part use *rgz* and *zw'* to render *rgz*, the translation of *rgz* in the LXX and Vg. is extremely heterogeneous; each version uses more than fifteen roots.[12] For the LXX, the most important equivalents are *-org-* (14 instances), *-thym-* (12), and *-tarass-* (8); for the Vg., *-turb-* (17), *-mov-* (8), and *-ira-* (8). The distribution of translations with the semantic effect of "anger" shows that the Vg. renders the Hebrew meaning more accurately than the LXX, which was probably influenced by the lexical stock of Aramaic.[13]

II. 1. *Usage.* Imperfective forms of the verb *rgz* (17 imperf., 4 perf. consecutive) predominate over perfective forms (7 perf., 5 imperf. consecutive). There is one vetitive (Gen. 45:24) and two imperatives (Isa. 32:11 [Aramaic form]; Ps. 4:5[Eng. 4]). The hithpael infinitive construct occurs 4 times (2 K. 19:27,28 = Isa. 37:28,29), the hiphil participle 3 (Isa. 14:16; Job 9:6; 12:6). In the derived stems the subject is always animate. In the qal, animate subjects predominate; inanimate subjects are usually geographical expressions: the heavens (2 S. 22:8; [Isa. 13:13?]), the earth (1 S. 14:15; Joel 2:10; Am. 8:8; Ps. 77:19[18]; Prov. 30:21), the mountains (Isa. 5:25; Ps. 18:8[7]), Sheol (Isa. 14:9), the deep (Ps. 77:17[16]). The other inanimate subjects represent a human being by synecdoche (a part of the body: *beṭen,* Hab. 3:16) or denote a region (the tents of Midian, Hab. 3:7).[14] In the case of nouns and adjectives, the agent subject is always animate; the affected subject may be inanimate, such as a part of the body (heart, Dt. 28:65) or the earth (Job 39:24).

Of the 33 occurrences of the qal, 22 are monovalent, having only a subject. We also find the syntagms: direct object (hiphil: a human being [1 S. 28:15; Ezk. 12:18], God [Job 12:6; Ezr. 5:12], the earth, etc. [Isa. 13:13? 14:16; 23:11; Job 9:6) and prepositional object denoting the opponent (always God; qal, Ezk. 16:43? all others are instances of the hithpael) or the causative agent (God, Isa. 64:1; human beings, Isa. 14:9; Hab. 3:16 [text?]; animals, Joel 2:10; beneficence, Jer. 33:9; injustice, Am. 8:8; Prov. 30:21). In Mic. 7:17 the nature of the verbal clause (prepositional expressions with *min* and *'al*) suggests separative motion: "they shall go forth trembling"; this is an instance of *constructio praegnans.*[15] Free syntagms are rare: local (Gen. 45:24; Sir. 34:24), temporal (Isa. 32:11), final (Isa. 28:21), modal (1 S. 28:15).

---

10. M. Görg, *GM* 47 (1981) 21.
11. *GesTh,* 1260.
12. For the LXX see R. Bultmann, "λύπη," *TDNT,* IV, 317; O. Grether and J. Fichtner, "ὀργή," *TDNT,* V, 409-12.
13. See II.3 below.
14. C. Siegberg and B. Stade, *Hebräisches Wörterbuch zum AT* (Leipzig, 1893), 702. It is also possible that the emphasis is on the "earthquake safety" of the tents: A. Deissler, *Zwölf Propheten,* II. *NEB* (1984), 232.
15. *GK,* §119ee; *BDB,* 919.

The absence of the qal participle, the thematic vowel *-a-* in the qal imperfective, and the limited use of the root in combination with other syntagms suggest that *rgz* is a stative verb. A poverty of syntactic structures also characterizes the nouns: enclitic pronoun (Isa. 14:3; Sir. 5:6), construct phrase (Job 37:2). Finally, we may note the concentration of *rgz* in Isa. 14 (3 times) and Hab. 3 (4 times).

2. *Lexical Fields.* In the context of *rgz* we find the synonymous roots *d'g* (Ezk. 12:18), *ḥwl* (Ex. 15:14; Dt. 2:25; Ps. 77:17[16]), *ḥrd* (1 S. 14:15; Isa. 32:11), *yr'* (Dt. 2:25; Mic. 7:17), *nwṭ* (Ps. 99:1), *pḥd* (Dt. 2:25; Jer. 33:9; Mic. 7:17), *plṣ* (Job 9:6), and *r'š* (2 S. 22:8 par. Ps. 18:8[7]; Isa. 13:13; 14:16; Ezk. 12:18; Joel 2:10; Ps. 77:19[18]; Job 39:24); cf. also *bhl, mwg,* and *r'd* in Ex. 15:15. These roots all share the semantic feature of "trembling."[16]

The antonymic roots found in the context of *rgz* are *'mn* (Job 39:24; cf. Dt. 28:66), *bṭḥ* (Isa. 32:10,11; Job 12:6; cf. Ps. 4:6[5]), *dmm* (Ps. 4:5[4]), *nwḥ* (Dt. 28:65; 2 S. 7:10 [cf. v. 11]; Isa. 14:3; Hab. 3:16; Job 3:17,26; Prov. 29:9; cf. Ezk. 16:43), *rg'* (Dt. 28:65; Jer. 50:34), *š'n* (Isa. 32:11 [cf. Job 3:18 and 12:5, but not 2 K. 19:28 par. Isa. 37:29, where the correct reading is *šā'ôn*]), *škn* (2 S. 7:10 par. 1 Ch. 17:9), *šlw* (Job 3:26; 12:6), and *šqṭ* (Job 3:26; cf. Ezk. 16:42). This lexical field may be characterized by the semantic features of "security, self-assurance, (being or achieving) calm."

Often in the context of *rgz* we find expressions conveying the semantic effect of "anger," including the roots *'np* (2 K. 19:28 par. Isa. 37:29; Isa. 5:25; 13:13; Sir. 5:6 [cf. 2 S. 22:9 par. Ps. 18:9(8)]; Mic. 7:18; Job 9:5), *ḥrh* (2 S. 22:8 par. Ps. 18:8[7]; Isa. 5:25; 13:13), and *'br* (Isa. 13:13). Finally, in the context of *rgz* we find verbs denoting sensory perception: *r'h* (Isa. 14:16; Mic. 7:16-17; Ps. 77:17[16]), *šm'* (Ex. 15:14; Dt. 2:25; Jer. 33:9; Hab. 3:16); in these cases *rgz* denotes the reaction to the perception.

3. *Meaning.* The statistics relating to the lexical field of *rgz* permit certain semantic conclusions. The Hebrew root has an invariant semantic core conveying the sense that the subject is powerfully moved, outwardly or inwardly. Other aspects depend on the specific context (depending on the agent, felicitous or oppressive;[17] depending on the direction, moved or moving; etc.). If the use of the verb with an inanimate subject is prior to its use with an animate subject, the verb with an animate subject denotes primarily a somatic phenomenon ("tremble"), as texts like Ezk. 12:18 suggest,[18] secondarily a psychic emotion ("be[come] disturbed"). There is no trace of semantic development in the direction of the more restricted meaning "anger." It is worth noting, however, that in the context of *rgz* the lexical fields "disturbance" and "anger" are mutually exclusive. This observation suggests that twofold use of *rgz:* to express "disturbance" and (less often) to express "anger."

Semantic analysis of the theological significant noun *rōgez* is made more difficult

---

16. → VI, 291-95.

17. *NBSS,* 85-86.

18. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 277-78; for a different view see F. Horst, *Hiob. BK* XVI/1 (^{3}1983), 37, on Job 3:26.

by the absence of the lexical field "anger" in any of its contexts (cf. the differing interpretations of Hab. 3:2 in comms.).

a. Job epitomizes the human condition in a pregnant formula: "A mortal, born of woman, few of days and full of trouble *(rōḡez)*" (Job 14:1; cf. Gen. 35:29: "full of days"). This aphoristic formula suggests everything that "affects human beings physically and mentally, everything that troubles and agitates them."[19]

This agitation can be brought on by news of death (to David, 2 S. 19:1; to the self-assured [*bṭḥ*] women of Jerusalem in an ironic dirge, Isa. 32:10,11), a hostile attack (during travel, Gen. 45:24 [not "quarrel"]),[20] or an injustice (Ps. 4:5[4];[21] Job 3:26). The wicked, fools, and animals attract attention by their impetuousness and emotional outbursts (Job 3:17; 39:24; Prov. 29:9; Dnl. 3:13; Sir. 34:21[?]). Kings, fools, and chaotic situations can make the earth and Sheol tremble (Isa. 14:9,16; Prov. 30:21). Canaanite inscriptions speak of "rousing" shades of the dead;[22] the same usage appears in the OT (1 S. 28:15; cf. Isa. 14:9).

Job 12:6 may be related to this usage: "Those who provoke El are secure."[23] Both faithless Jerusalem (Ezk. 16:42 cj.) and its enemy Sennacherib (2 K. 19:27,28 par. Isa. 37:28,29) are accused by the prophet of having aroused themselves against God. In their declaration to Tattenai, the Judahites summarize the transgressions of their preexilic ancestors (described in the Dtr History with extensive incriminating terminology) in a single sentence: "They provoked (*rgz* haphel) the God of heaven" (Ezr. 5:12).

b. Both curses and promises of salvation ascribe to God the "agitation" that detracts seriously from human life, thus setting it in a theological context. Nathan's promise to David foresees the end of Israel's oppression at the hands of the wicked, so that the people will no longer need to "tremble" (2 S. 7:10 par. 1 Ch. 17:9). Am. 8:8 interprets an earthquake as God's judgment on those who exploit the needy. If Israel proves disobedient, the sanctions of Deuteronomy promise unceasing disturbance at the hands of the nations and a trembling heart *(lēḇ raggāz)* sent by Yahweh (28:65).[24] A symbolic action on the part of the prophet (eating and drinking with quaking and trembling) is a harbinger of the catastrophe awaiting the besieged population (Ezk. 12:18). The introduction to a postexilic taunt song against the king of Babylon (i.e., Persia[25]) promises Israel deliverance from the "turmoil" sent by God (*rogzeḵā* par. *hā*ʿ*ᵃḇōḏâ haqqāšâ,* Isa. 14:3). The joyous occasion of Jerusalem's restoration will lead the nations to tremble in recognition of all Yahweh's beneficence (Jer. 33:9).

In hymnic texts *rgz* is coupled with the revelation of Yahweh's power. Accounts of the wars of Yahweh and texts dealing with Yahweh's battles with the nations and with

---

19. Horst, *BK* XVI/1³, 52-53.

20. *LexHebAram,* 755: "may your journey be peaceful, free of terror"; the versions understand the text differently.

21. C. Westermann, *The Living Psalms* (Eng. trans. Grand Rapids, 1989), 123-27.

22. *KAI,* 9A.5; 13.4,6,7.

23. G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (²1989), 232.

24. → XI, 520.

25. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1997), 49-50.

chaos (often associated with exodus motifs) repeatedly describe the trembling of the earth (1 S. 14:15; Ps. 77:19[18]; cf. Hab. 3:7 [the tents of Midian]), the mountains (Ps. 18:8[7] [cf. 2 S. 22:8: "the heavens"]; Isa. 5:25), the deep (Ps. 77:17[16]), and the nations (Ex. 15:14; Dt. 2:25 [out of fear of Israel[26]]; Isa. 64:1[2]; Mic. 7:17 [reminiscent of Ps. 18:46(45)[27]]; Ps. 99:1). This is not the place to discuss the problems raised by these texts.[28] We shall merely point out the wide range of effects of the revelations that occasion agitation — from writhing in anguish (Dt. 2:25) to praising the name of Yahweh (Ps. 99:1-3).[29] Such effects appear also in the remaining texts to be discussed: in the "earthquake" of Habakkuk (Hab. 3:16 [*rgz* twice]) after the theophanic vision of God's judgment, there are intermingled quiet (v. 16), rejoicing, and exultation (v. 18). Nevertheless, the approaching day of Yahweh is unendurable (Joel 2:11); it makes all the inhabitants of the land tremble (v. 1). The description of the invading locusts, before which heaven and earth tremble (v. 10), "provides the listener and reader with a model of the 'apocalyptic army' of the 'day of Yahweh.'"[30]

c. In eight texts God is associated with *rgz,* always in connection with a revelation of his power. He "rouses himself" against Jerusalem, to do a "strange deed" (Isa. 28:21); the allusion to 2 S. 5 suggests a perverted war of Yahweh (*rgz* qal). As creator and judge, he causes the earth (Job 9:6) and the heavens (Isa. 13:13, judgment on Babylon [text?]) to tremble. He shakes kingdoms (Isa. 23:11, judgment on Tyre); as Israel's strong redeemer, he gives rest to the land, but unrest to the inhabitants of Babylon (Jer. 50:34) (*rgz* hiphil in both texts). Elihu speaks of the rousing thunder of God's voice (*rōgez,* Job 37:2). The prophet prays that God will have mercy *(rḥm)* on the "agitation" (*rōgez,* Hab. 3:2).[31] But whoever blasphemously presumes on God's mercy will face the anger of God's "agitation" (*'ap* and *rōgez,* Sir. 5:6).

The root has not yet been found in the Dead Sea Scrolls; there are a few occurrences in other intertestamental literature.[32]

Vanoni

26. → XI, 523.
27. G. Schmuttermayr, *Ps 18 und 2 Sam 22. SANT* 25 (1971), 177-78.
28. See Jeremias; Stolz (with bibliog.).
29. J. Jeremias, *Das Konigtum Gottes in den Psalmen. FRLANT* 141 (1987), 116.
30. A. Deissler, *Zwölf Propheten* I. *NEB* (1985), 75, discussing vv. 4-5.
31. W. Rudolph, *Habakuk. KAT* XIII/3 (1975), 242: "no safe place for wrath"; see also B. Margulis, *ZAW* 82 (1970) 413.
32. See J. A. Fitzmyer and D. J. Harrington, *Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts. BietOr* 34 (1978), 337.

רֶגֶל *regel*; רָגַל *rāgal*; מַרְגְּלוֹת *marg^elôṯ*; רַגְלִי *raglî*; רְגָלִים *r^egālîm*

I. The Word. II. Ancient Near East: 1. Egypt; 2. Mesopotamia; 3. Syria and Phoenicia. III. OT: 1. Literal Usage; 2. Figurative Usage; 3. Symbolism; 4. God. IV. Derivatives: 1. *rāgal;* 2. *margᵉlôṯ;* 3. *raglî;* 4. *rᵉgālîm.* V. Deuterocanonical Texts. VI. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. The Word. The noun *regel* occurs 245 times in the OT. It also appears in Biblical Aramaic as *rᵉgal.* In Old Aramaic, more specifically Yaudic, we find *lgr*[1] (cf. Mand. *ligra*[2] and Eth. *'ĕgr*[3]); reciprocal dissimilation of sonants[4] leads to Imperial Aram.[5] and

---

regel. P.-R. Berger, "Ellasar, Tarschisch und Jawan, Gn 14 und 10," *WO* 13 (1982) 50-78; T. Blätter, *Macht und Herrschaft Gottes. Studia Friburgensia* 29 (1962); E. Dhorme, *L'emploi métaphorique des noms des parties du corps en hébreu et en akkadien* (Paris, 1923, ²1963); E. Ebeling, "Fuss," *RLA,* III, 123; G. Fitzer, "Fusswaschung," *BHHW,* I, 506; G. Fohrer, "Barfuss," *BHHW,* I, 1998; *idem,* "Schuwerk," *BHHW,* III, 1738; M. Görg, "Alles hast Du gelegt unter seine Füsse," *FS H. Gross. SBB* 13 (²1987), 125-48; F. Gössmann, "'Scabellum pedum tuorum,'" *Divinitas* 11 (1967) 31-53; R. Hentschke, "Fuss," *BHHW,* I, 505-6; F. Hintze, "*Hdm rdwy* 'Fußschemel,'" *ZÄS* 79 (1954) 77; J. K. Hoffmeier, "Some Egyptian Motifs Related to Enemies and Warfare and Their OT Counterparts," *FS J. R. Williams. Ancient World* 6 (1983), 53-70; A. R. Johnson, *The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel* (Cardiff, ²1964); O. Keel, *Jahwe-Visionen und Siegelkunst. SBS* 84/85 (1977); *idem,* "Symbolik des Fusses im AT und seiner Umwelt," *Orthopädische Praxis* 18 (1982) 530-38; *idem, Die Welt der altorientalischen Bildsymbolik und das AT* (Zurich, ²1977); O. Komlós, "תֻּכּוּ לְרַגְלֶךָ (Deut. XXXIII 3)," *VT* 6 (1956) 435-36; M. Küchler, "Die 'Füsse des Herrn' (Eus., DE 6,18)," *FS H. und O. Keel-Leu. Novum Testamentum et orbis antiquus* 6 (1987), 11-35; K. P. Kuhlmann, "Thron," *LexÄg,* VI, 523-29; R. Labat, "Fusskrankheiten," *RLA,* III, 126-27; M. Lurker, *Wörterbuch biblischer Bilder und Symbole* (Munich, ²1978), esp. 111-12; M. Metzger, "Himmlische und irdische Wohnstatt Jahwes," *UF* 2 (1970) 139-58; idem, *Königsthron und Gottesthron. AOAT* 15/1-2 (1985); *idem,* "Der Thron als Manifestation der Herrschermacht in der Ikonographie des Vorderen Orients und im AT," in T. Rendtorff, ed., *Charisma und Institution* (Gütersloh, 1985), 250-96; G. G. Nicol, "Watering Egypt (Deut. XI 10-11) Again," *VT* 38 (1988) 347-48; A. Oepke, "ὑποδέω," *TDNT,* V, 310-12; G. Rühlmann, "'Deine Feinde fallen unter deine Sohlen,'" *WZ Halle* 20 (1971) 61-84; F. J. Stendebach, "Theologische Anthropologie des Jahwisten" (diss., Bonn, 1970); E. Unger, "Fuss als Symbol," *RLA,* III, 123; W. Vycichl, "Das Zeichen für *d* 'Hand' in der Hieroglyphenschrift und die semitischen Entsprechungen des zugrunde liegenden Etymons," *ZÄS* 112 (1985) 169-79; K. Weiss, "πούς," *TDNT,* VI, 624-31; H. W. Wolff, *Anthropology of the OT* (Eng. trans. Philadelphia, 1974).

→ הדם *hᵃḏōm;* → מוט *mwṭ.*

1. *DISO,* 274; J. Friedrich, *Phönizisch-punische Grammatik. AnOr* 32 (1951), 42*; M. Lidzbarski, *Handbuch der nordsemitischen Epigraphik* (Weimar, 1898), 368.
2. *MdD,* 235.
3. *LexLingAeth,* 804-5.
4. *VG,* I, 227, 231, 295.
5. *DISO,* 274; Ahiqar 80,122,123,206; *AP,* 30.16; 31.15.

Palmyr.[6] *rgl,* Jewish Aram. *rîglāʾ/raglāʾ,*[7] and Syr. *reglā.*[8] In Old South Arabic we find *rgl,*[9] and in Arabic *riǧl.*[10]

The root is not found in Phoenician and Ugaritic; instead, the former uses *pʿm* and the latter *pʿn.*[11]

The verb *rāgal* should probably be considered denominative from *regel.*[12] In the qal it means "walk about" (cf. the toponym *ʿên rōgēl*) > "slander"; in the piel it means "explore (a land or city)" > "spy out,"[13] with the preps. *b*ᵉ and *ʾel,* "speak slanderously of . . . to. . . ." In the tiphel (found only in Hos. 11:3), it means "teach to walk."[14]

The lexical field includes *ʾāšur,* "footstep" (from *ʾšr* I, "step, walk"); *paʿam,* "step"; *maʿgāl,* "track"; *kᵉrāʿayim,* "shin(bone)s"; *ʿāqēb,* "heel"; *kap,* "sole," and *parsâ,* "(divided) hoof."

In Mesopotamia the Sumerian word for "foot" is *gir;* the Akkadian word is *šēpu(m),*[15] with the possibly denominative verb *šêpu,* "step."[16] We also find *pēmu(m), pēnu,* "thigh."[17]

The Egyptian word for "foot" is *rd.*[18] The phrase *hdm rdwy,* "footstool," corresponds to Heb. *hᵃdōm raglayim; hdm* is a Semitic loanword.[19] The view that unqualified *hdm* means "footstool,"[20] so that the clarifying phrase is Semitic, is supported by the phrase *hdm n tꜣty,* "footstool of the vizier," and the fact that Ugar. *hdm* by itself means "footstool."[21] We may also note the use of the phrase *hypopódion (tṓ) podṓn* by the LXX to translate the phrase.[22] The LXX translates *regel* as *poús.*[23]

II. Ancient Near East.

1. *Egypt.* In Egypt foot symbolism is especially important. The cluster of hegemony symbols includes representations of the foreign nations or their hieroglyphic equivalent, nine bows, on the footstool and throne platform of the king.[24] Three lapwings,

6. *CIS,* II, 4058, 6.
7. *ANH,* 378.
8. *LexSyr,* 712.
9. Biella, 479.
10. Wehr, 329.
11. *KBL*², 872; cf. *UT,* no. 2076; → פעם *pʿm.*
12. *KBL*², contra *GesB,* 744.
13. But see W. von Soden, *Bibel und Alter Orient. BZAW* 162 (1985), 201.
14. *GK,* §55h; H. W. Wolff, *Hosea. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1974), 199; *KBL*², 872.
15. A. Deimel, *Šumerisches Lexikon* (Rome, 1925-37), III, 63; Ebeling; *AHw,* III, 1214-15.
16. *AHw,* III, 1215.
17. *AHw,* II, 854.
18. *WbÄS,* II, 461-62; Vycichl, 170.
19. J. Osing, *Die Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen,* I-II (Mainz, 1976), 374; Kuhlmann, 524; W. Helck, *ÄgAbh* 5 (1962) 565-66.
20. *WbÄS,* II, 505.
21. *UT,* no. 751.
22. Hintze; Hoffmeier, 63; cf. P. Artzi, *FS S. Yeivin* (Jerusalem, 1970), 221-37.
23. Weiss, 626.
24. Kuhlmann, 526; O. Keel, *ZDPV* 93 (1977) 167.

whose Egyptian name *rḫyt* also means "nation, subject," symbolize approximately the same thing as the nine bows: they lie helpless at the feet of the ruler.[25] The purpose of these representations is nothing more than to show that the king will permanently subdue enemy aggression. The fifteen gods of the groups of deities, with Amun, the god of the Egyptian empire, at their head, can also be represented with bows under their feet.[26] The vanquished enemies can also be engraved on the sandals of the king.[27] The Egyptian phrase *ḫr ṯb(w)t/ṯbty,* "under the sandals," meaning "be subject to someone," is attested as early as the Pyramid Texts. An inscription of Thutmose III reads: "All the lands, all the foreign lands . . . that did not know Egypt, have been united under your sandals." During the Eighteenth Dynasty this idiom became a standard formula applied to the pharaoh as protector of Egypt, not necessarily with any implications of military action.[28]

Another perspective is represented by the image of the pharaoh trampling on the enemy; this image appears, e.g., on the palette of Narmer, where the king is represented as a bull trampling the enemy underfoot.[29] The pharaoh is thus depicted as the conqueror and occupier of a foreign land.[30] There may also have been some kind of seizure action on the part of the pharaoh.[31]

The representations "that depict a 'treading underfoot' with the connotation of hegemonic sovereignty . . . [are to be interpreted] in the first instance as visual transpositions . . . of the mythologically rooted idea of victory over the forces of chaos."[32]

In the Amarna texts we find an expression used by a vassal to describe himself to the pharaoh as "the footstool of your feet," acknowledging that he has prostrated himself at the feet of his lord.[33]

The deity's feet, too, symbolized sovereignty; as the lowest portion of the god, they were all that a mortal might venture to approach. We may note Late Egyptian bronzes depicting a worshiper kneeling at the feet of an outsize deity.[34] In this context we may also mention the practice of laying treaties at the feet of the deities of the signatories, so that they might serve as witnesses.[35]

Stamping one's feet, clapping one's hands, and the like "are both bodily movements and acoustic phenomena to accompany dance rhythms, processional choruses, announcements, and recitations."[36]

---

25. Keel, *Welt,* 230, 233.
26. Keel, "Symbolik," 513.
27. *Ibid.,* 532; Rühlmann, 74.
28. Hoffmeier, 56, 59-60, 63; Görg, 134-35; cf. Metzger, *Königsthron,* 46, 91-92; *idem,* "Thron," 257-58; → III, 328-30.
29. *AOB,* no. 9, with pls. 26-27.
30. Hoffmeier, 63-64.
31. Keel, *ZDPV* 93 (1977) 156.
32. Görg, 145.
33. EA 195:9-15; Metzger, "Thron," 265.
34. Keel, "Symbolik," 536; *idem, Jahwe-Visionen,* 35.
35. G. J. Botterweck, *Alttestamentliche Studien. FS F. Nötscher. BBB* 1 (1950) 28.
36. E. Hickmann, *LexÄg* III, 670; Keel, *Welt* 314.

Toward the end of the Old Kingdom, the dead were buried with legs made of carnelian, a magical device to preserve their own legs and their ability to stand and walk. Ch. 92 of the Book of the Dead served the same purpose.[37]

2. *Mesopotamia.* In Mesopotamia *šēpu* is used metaphorically for the bottom of a mountain, hill, or piece of furniture. In Assyrian texts the word can mean "caravan." Its use as a euphemism for the genitals is also attested.

The foot is the identifying symbol of the god Ishum, who also bears the epithet "long-foot"; he is the "nocturnal wanderer" and "watchman of the roads."[38]

"The treatise on prognoses discusses . . . the symptoms observed in diseases of the foot. . . . Among the therapeutic texts, several tablets . . . deal with the treatment of foot ailments."[39]

As early as the Old Sumerian period, we find theriomorphic footstools for gods, especially on Cappadocian cylinder seals.[40] When wild animals are involved, the footstool probably symbolizes their subjugation by the king.[41] Deities associated with vegetation are often depicted as being enthroned on a mountain, upon which their feet rest or stand.[42]

Neo-Assyrian cylinder seals of the 9th and 8th centuries depicting the sovereign with his feet on a domestic animal while warding off an attacking lion indicate that sovereignty also brings responsibility: he must protect his subjects against powerful enemies.[43]

The identification of the foot as a symbol of sovereignty appears also in literary texts. A Sumero-Akkadian hymn declares that Anu placed the earth like a sandal under the feet of Inanna/Ishtar.[44] In Assyria there is more emphasis on the motif of subjugation. For example, Tukulti-Ninurta I says of Kashtiliash IV of Babylon: "I placed my feet upon his lordly neck as on a footstool."[45] The foot was also considered an instrument of ownership, as in the practice of raising one's foot from the soil of the land one is selling and having the purchaser step upon the same soil.[46]

3. *Syria and Phoenicia.* In Syro-Phoenicia, too, we find the same cluster of ideas. At Ugarit a god's feet were considered symbols of divine sovereignty, before which others would bow.[47] There is also evidence of a footstool associated with the throne.[48] Espe-

---

37. Keel, "Symbolik," 530.
38. Unger.
39. Labat, 126.
40. Metzger, *Königsthron,* 134ff.
41. *Idem,* "Thron," 267, 273.
42. *Idem, ZDPV* 99 (1983) 59ff.
43. Keel, "Symbolik," 533; *idem, Welt,* 49-50; E. Zenger, *Gottes Bogen in den Wolken. SBS* 112 (^{2}1987), 91; *idem, Der Dienst für den Menschen in Theologie und Verkündigung. FS A. Brems* (Regensburg, 1981), 136-37.
44. A. Falkenstein, *BiOr* 9 (1952) 90; Keel, "Symbolik," 536.
45. E. Weidner, *Inschriften Tukulti-Ninurtas. BAfO* 12 (1959), no. 5, 62; → III, 328.
46. E. Cassin, *L'Année sociologique* 3 (1952) 121-22; Keel, "Symbolik," 531-32.
47. *KTU,* 1.3, III, 9; VI, 18; 1.4, VIII, 26; 1.5, I, 36; 1.10, II, 18.

cially informative is the text in which ʿAṯtar is invited to sit on the throne of Aliyan Baal, but his feet do not reach the footstool and his head does not reach the top of the throne.[49] Since the god cannot fill the throne of Baal, he must abdicate.[50]

The tauromorphic animals that kill Baal by tearing him apart attack his feet.[51] ʿAnat's feet tremble in panic when she sees the messengers of Baal.[52] But she can also jump for joy with her feet.[53]

Feet function as an instrument of rapid locomotion when Aliyan Baal sends word to ʿAnat that her feet may rush to him.[54]

The foot as a symbol of oppression appears in the statement that the poor *(dl)* "are trampled *(tš)* underfoot."[55]

The similarity of Ugaritic poetry to Hebrew poetry is clear in their use of equivalent combinations. For example, *pʿn,* "foot," appears with *pnm,* "face,"[56] and *pnt,* "corner."[57] The idiom "his leg bespeaks hostility"[58] represents a parallel to Prov. 6:13.

In Phoenician and Punic, too, the foot symbolized sovereignty. A votive offering is placed "under the feet" of Baal-Shamem as a memorial of the donor.[59] In an inscription from Karatepe, Azitawada says that he has placed the leaders of gangs beneath his feet.[60]

We also find ritual regulations stipulating that the feet of a sacrificial animals belong to the one who offers the sacrifice.[61]

The "foot" is used figuratively in an inscription that describes the renovation of a "sacrificial site with feet."[62]

The cover of a pyxis from Minet el-Beda has an ivory relief depicting an enthroned goddess with her feet on a pediment stylized like a mountain, which thus serves as her footstool.[63]

III. OT.

1. *Literal Usage.* The noun *regel* denotes the foot as the bodily organ of a human or animal. Gen. 8:9 says that the dove found no place to set the sole *(kap̱)* of its foot (cf.

48. *KTU,* 1.6, III, 15; 1.17, II, 11.
49. *KTU,* 1.6, I, 58ff.
50. Keel, *Jahwe-Visionen,* 35.
51. *KTU,* 1.12, II, 33.
52. *KTU,* 1.3, III, 32.
53. *KTU,* 1.4, V, 21.
54. *KTU,* 1.3, III, 19; cf. 1.12, I, 40.
55. *KTU,* 1.16, VI, 48; → III, 213.
56. *KTU,* 1.3, III, 32-34; 1.4, II, 16-18; 1.10, II, 17-18; cf. Ps. 57:7(6).
57. *KTU,* 1.3, III, 32-34; cf. Prov. 7:12.
58. *KTU,* 1.101, 6.
59. *KAI,* 80.1.
60. *KAI,* 26A.I.16.
61. *KAI,* 69.4,6,10.
62. *KAI,* 80.1.
63. Metzger, *ZDPV* 99 (1983) 54-56.

Dt. 28:65). The Israelites are to eat the Passover lamb with their sandals on their feet (Ex. 12:11).

Feet are a means of locomotion. Israel goes on foot *(bᵉrāg̱lay)* through the territory of Edom (Nu. 20:19; Dt. 2:28). According to the Song of Deborah, Barak was "sent" (*šlḥ* pual) on foot[64] into the valley (Jgs. 5:15). The movement involved can be violent. The soles of the priests' feet tear loose (*ntq* niphal) from the muddy riverbed to rest on the dry shore (Josh. 4:18). Sisera flees on foot (Jgs. 4:15,17). On his hands and feet, Jonathan climbs up to the Philistine outpost (1 S. 14:13). Comparison to an animal is vivid: Asahel was as swift (qal) of foot as a wild gazelle (2 S. 2:18; cf. Am. 2:15). Great speed may also be expressed by saying that someone's feet scarcely touch the path (Isa. 41:3).[65] To send (*šlḥ* piel) an animal's foot away means to let it range freely (Isa. 32:20).[66] The feet as a means of locomotion make a sound (*qôl*, 1 K. 14:6; 2 K. 6:32).

The foot is the part of the body that steps or stands on the ground. An overly refined woman is described as never venturing to set (*yṣg* hiphil) the sole of her foot on the ground (Dt. 28:56). The soles of the feet of the priests who are bearing the ark rest *(nwḥ)* in the water of the Jordan (Josh. 3:13; cf. 3:15; 4:3,9; also Isa. 66:1). "Without foot" (Job 28:4; possibly a gloss[67]), i.e., without using their feet, describes miners suspended in their safety ropes.[68]

The place where someone is staying can be paraphrased as "the place where his foot is" (1 S. 23:22). A person setting out lifts *(nś')* his feet (Gen. 29:1).

"To rise up or stand on one's feet" *(qwm/ʿmd ʿal-raglayim)* can refer simply to the act of standing up, e.g., to begin speaking (1 Ch. 28:2); but it can also mean that someone comes back to life (2 K. 13:21; Ezk. 37:10; cf. Ezk. 2:1-2; 3:24). Conversely, the expression "while they are still on their feet" (Zec. 14:12) means "while they are still alive."[69] The statement that Jacob "drew *(ʾsp)* his feet up into the bed" (Gen. 49:33) means that he deliberately lay down to die.

Feet are also used for work. Egypt is a land where the soil is irrigated by foot, i.e., artificially (Dt. 11:10). The expression probably refers to a foot-powered sakieh or shadoof, not simply the use of the foot to open irrigation ditches.[70] Gen. 41:44 uses the idiom "lift up [*rwm* hiphil] hand or foot" to include all forms of activity. This expression reflects a legal practice similar to the Roman *vindicatio*. "The fact that no one in Egypt can lift up hand or foot without Joseph can describe his authority over the land."[71]

---

64. F. J. Helfmeyer, *Die Nachfolge Gottes im AT. BBB* 29 (1968), 76, interprets the expression in the sense of following a leader's orders.

65. K. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja. BK* XI/1 (1989), 106, 121-22.

66. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 2002), 263; for a different interpretation see *AuS*, II, 239: sending to work.

67. G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (^{2}1989), 391.

68. *Ibid.*, 397.

69. K. Elliger, *Sacharja. ATD* XXV (^{3}1985), 184.

70. *AuS*, II, 230, 238.

71. C. Westermann, *Genesis 37–50* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1986), 96, citing Z. W. Falk, *JSS* 12 (1967) 243-44.

Ezekiel is ordered to stamp *(rq')* his foot (Ezk. 6:11; cf. 25:6).[72] "The mere act of stamping one's foot . . . is in itself a gesture of self-assertion and triumph."[73] See also Ezk. 32:2;[74] 34:18-19; Job 39:15.

As the lowest part of the human body, the feet come in contact with the dirt and dust of the street. They are therefore washed upon entering a house (2 S. 11:8; Cant. 5:3). Similarly, guests are immediately offered water to wash their feet (Gen. 18:4; 19:2; 24:32; 43:24; Jgs. 19:21; cf. 1 S. 25:41).[75] When a person is slain, the killer gets the victim's blood on his sandals and therefore also on his feet (1 K. 2:5). Since the feet are a point of contact with the unclean environment,[76] priests must wash their feet before beginning their duties (Ex. 30:19,21; 40:31 — probably as a substitute for an immersed bath).[77] Feet and legs can also be made unclean from above, e.g., by afterbirth (*šilyâ,* Dt. 28:57). Urine is therefore called "foot water" (2 K. 18:27 *Q* par. Isa. 36:12 *Q*). On this basis, Nicol interprets Dt. 11:10 as an ironic allusion to the size of the Israelite territory in Egypt, which was so small that a man could irrigate all the land he possessed by urinating on it.[78] Defecation is referred to euphemistically as "covering the feet" (*skk* hiphil, Jgs. 3:24; 1 S. 24:4[3]).[79] Because such a zone of uncleanness attracts unclean spirits, the high priest wears apotropaic bells on the hem of his robe (Ex. 28:33-35; 39:25-26; Sir. 45:9).[80]

This usage also explains the euphemistic use of *regel* for the genitalia (Ex. 4:25; Isa. 7:20).[81] In Ezk. 16:25 "spreading the legs" (*pśq* piel) describes sexual provocation on the part of a promiscuous woman.

The custom of removing one's sandals before stepping onto holy ground (Ex. 3:5; Josh. 5:15) is accounted for by the vulnerability of sandals to contact with the zone of uncleanness. The priests clearly perform their ministry barefoot; the description of the priestly vestments in Lev. 8 does not mention footwear.[82] Since the realm of death is also numinous, rites of mourning include going barefoot (2 S. 15:30; Ezk. 24:17,23; Mic. 1:8) and not taking care of one's feet (2 S. 19:25). Prisoners of war are made to go barefoot as a mark of degradation (Isa. 20:2-4).[83] It has also been suggested that going barefoot in cultic contexts symbolizes nakedness by synecdoche.[84]

The particular proximity of the feet to the realm of the unclean is probably also the

---

72. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 180.
73. Keel, "Symbolik," 532.
74. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 159.
75. See Fitzer.
76. Keel, "Symbolik," 535.
77. F. Heiler, *Erscheinungsformen und Wesen der Religion. RM* 1 (1961), 187.
78. Nicol, 347.
79. *HAL,* II, 754.
80. Keel, "Symbolik," 536.
81. H. Junker, *FS Nötscher. BBB* 1 (1950), 128; Stendebach, 278; H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1991), 324; H.-J. Hermisson, *Sprache und Ritus im altisraelitischen Kult. WMANT* 19 (1965), 66.
82. Weiss, 627; Keel, "Symbolik," 536.
83. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1997), 293.
84. E. Drewermann, *Tiefenpsychologie und Exegese,* II (Olten, ^{2}1986), 384ff.; Weiss, 625.

reason why blood is applied to the big toe of the right foot when a priest is ordained (Ex. 29:20; Lev. 8:23-24). The same ritual, with the addition of anointing, is used in the purification of someone who has been cured of leprosy (Lev. 14:14,17,25,28) — an abundance of blessings is described by the statement that someone bathes *(ṭbl)* his foot in oil (Dt. 33:24).

Human well-being requires sound, healthy feet. For example, someone with a broken foot (or leg) cannot be admitted to priestly office (Lev. 21:19). Meribaal is "crippled of foot" (*nᵉḵēh raglayim,* 2 S. 4:4), lame (*psḥ* niphal, 2 S. 4:4; *pissēaḥ,* 2 S. 9:13; cf. 1 K. 15:23; 2 Ch. 16:12). Moses and Ezra describe Israel's invulnerability during the wilderness years by saying that their foot (i.e., feet[85]) did not swell (*bṣq,* Dt. 8:4; Neh. 9:21). For other injuries or abnormalities that can affect the foot, see Nu. 22:25; 2 S. 21:20; Prov. 6:28.

The law of talion requires not only "eye for eye" but also "foot for foot" (Ex. 21:24; Dt. 19:21).[86]

Fettering the feet deprives people of their freedom (*ngš,* 2 S. 3:34; cf. Ps. 105:18 [*ʿnh* II piel]; Job 33:11). In Ps. 22:17(16), instead of *kāʾᵃrî,* "like a lion," we should probably read a verb *kārû* (from *krh* IV), with the meaning "bind together, fetter."[87] The psalmist thus laments that his enemies have bound his feet, have taken him captive. Cutting off the hands and feet of slain enemies (*qṣṣ* piel) — probably as trophies of victory — is also attested (2 S. 4:12).[88]

The whole human body is encompassed by the formula "from head to foot" (Lev. 13:12). More common is the expression "from the sole of the foot to the crown of the head" (Dt. 28:35; 2 S. 14:25; Job 2:7) or "to the head" (Isa. 1:6). When the seraphim in Isa. 6:2 cover their feet with two of their wings, this is probably not a euphemism for their genitalia; they are to be thought of as covering themselves totally in the presence of the holy God.[89]

Animals, too, have feet. The laws defining which animals are clean and unclean speak of winged insects that have jointed legs *(kᵉrāʿayim)* above their feet (Lev. 11:21), a reference to the hopping feet of locusts, as well as insects that move on four or more feet (vv. 23,42). The living creatures bearing God's throne in Ezekiel's inaugural vision have straight legs; the soles of their feet resemble those of a calf and sparkle like burnished bronze (Ezk. 1:7).[90] The cherubim in the most holy place stand on their feet (2 Ch. 3:13). In Daniel's vision of the four beasts, the first is described as having its wings plucked off so that it has to stand on two feet like a human being (Dnl. 7:4). The

---

85. See *BHS.*

86. A. Alt, *KlSchr,* I (1953), 341-44; D. Daube, *Studies in Biblical Law* (1947; repr. New York, 1969), 102-53; W. Preiser, *FS E. Schmidt* (Göttingen, 1961), 7-38; V. Wagner, *Rechtssätze in gebundener Sprache und Rechtssatzreihen im israelitischen Recht. BZAW* 127 (1972), 3-14; C. Carmichael, *Biblical Laws of Talion* (Oxford, 1986), 21-39.

87. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1988), 297; *HAL,* II, 497.

88. *ANEP,* no. 118.

89. Keel, *Jahwe-Visionen,* 78-79, 113; contra Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12,* 265.

90. For a discussion of the textual problems, see Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1,* 83; for a different analysis see Keel, *Jahwe-Visionen,* 178-80, 213-15.

removal of the beast's wings is probably to be understood as symbolizing deprivation of power or as a parallel to the statement that it was given a human heart (NRSV "mind"). This humanization looks forward to v. 13 and suggests identification of the beast with the Neo-Babylonian Empire.[91]

The statue in Nebuchadnezzar's dream has feet made partly of iron and partly of clay. The different materials suggest the division of the final worldwide empire into two parts, one hard, the other fragile.[92] Idols, too, have feet, although polemic disparagement declares that they do not walk (Ps. 115:7; cf. Isa. 46:7; Jer. 10:5).[93] The table for the bread of the Presence is described figuratively as having feet (Ex. 25:26; 37:13; NRSV "legs"), an expression that may well reflect theriomorphic decoration of the table's legs.

2. *Figurative Usage.* By synecdoche the feet can stand for the entire person. "When your feet enter the city" (1 K. 14:12) means "when you enter the city" (cf. Isa. 23:7; Ezk. 29:11; 32:13; Ps. 122:2). The feet of the Jerusalemites "run to evil" (Isa. 59:7; cf. Job 31:5; Prov. 1:16; 6:18). The feet of the strange woman do not stay at home (Prov. 7:11) but go down to death (5:5).

In Gen. 30:30 Jacob says to Laban: "Yahweh has blessed you *l^{e}raglî.*" This expression probably means "after my time"; the moving foot symbolizes the passage of time.[94] Wolff, however, interprets the expression as "according to the steps, or measures, I took — the progress I brought about."[95]

In Gen. 33:14 Jacob wants to lead on slowly (*nhl* hithpael) *l^{e}regel* of the cattle and the children, i.e., at their pace. Ex. 11:8 speaks of the people *b^{e}raglayim* of Moses, i.e., going in Moses' footsteps, following him (cf. Jgs. 4:10; 8:5; 1 S. 25:27,42 [with *l^e*]; 2 S. 15:16-17,18 [*BHS*]; 1 K. 20:10; 2 K. 3:9).[96]

Often *regel* is used metaphorically. Job says: "I was feet to the lame" (29:15), i.e., "he was their guide and helper, serving as the eyes and feet of the helpless."[97] Isa. 52:7 describes the feet of the messenger of peace as "beautiful" *(n'h),* referring not to their appearance but to the response they evoke (cf. Nah. 2:1): the messenger is the joyous herald of good news.[98] We have here an example of "*synthetic* thinking, which by naming the part of the body means its function"[99] — against the background of the preference of Hebrew thought for the concrete (cf. also Isa. 58:13; Jer. 2:25; 14:10).[100]

Prov. 4:26 cautions: "Keep straight [*pls* piel] the path of your feet." Citing Akk.

---

91. O. Plöger, *Das Buch Daniel. KAT* XVIII (1983), 108.

92. *Ibid.,* 47.

93. H. D. Preuss, *Verspottung fremder Religionem im AT. BWANT* 92 (1971), 252.

94. *Synt,* 102, 116; *GesB,* 744; Stendebach, 278. C. Westermann, *Genesis. BK* I/2 (1983), 586-87, interprets the temporal consecution causally: "Because I am here."

95. Wolff, *Anthropology,* 67.

96. *Synt,* 116; Stendebach, 278.

97. Fohrer, *KAT* XVI, 409.

98. Küchler, 11.

99. Wolff, *Anthropology,* 8; cf. 67.

100. J. Koeberle, *Natur und Geist nach der Auffassung des ATs* (Munich, 1901), 38-41; Vycichl, 175.

palāsu/naplusu, Plöger suggests the translation "observe."[101] The path along which the feet are to travel is the course of human life through history. Those who with their feet move too hurriedly *('wṣ),* i.e., heedlessly, miss the way (Prov. 19:2). Therefore the psalmist declares that he turns his feet to Yahweh's decree (Ps. 119:59), while holding back his feet from every evil way (119:101; cf. Prov. 1:15; 4:27). These and similar passages portray the individual as *homo viator.*[102]

Qoheleth admonishes readers to guard their steps when they go to the house of God (Eccl. 4:17), thus opposing all human attempts to ensure God's favor through sacrifice, prayer, or other religious observances.[103]

Prov. 6:13 says that shuffling (*mll* III) or pointing (*mll* IV) with the feet is the mark of a scoundrel and a villain. "Inappropriate use of parts of the human body . . . betrays a perverse heart."[104] Prov. 25:19, "A crumbling tooth and a tottering *(mô'āḏeṯ)* foot: a faithless person in the day of trouble," warns that one should treat an injured part of the body with caution (or: a faithless person can no more be relied on than a bad tooth or a tottering foot[105]). According to 25:17, those who do not keep their feet rare (*yqr* hiphil) in the house of their neighbor soon become tiresome. Prov. 26:6 states: "To send a message by a fool is like cutting off [piel ptcp. of *qṣh* I] one's feet." "One who uses a fool to deliver an order . . . is looked on as a man who cuts off his own legs, which he should have used to deliver the message in person."[106]

In the language of prayer, too, *regel* is a common metaphor. Jeremiah, for instance, laments that snares have been laid for his feet (Jer. 18:22), so that his life is in danger. The psalmist speaks of those who boast against him when his foot slips (*mwṭ,* Ps. 38:17[16]), and declares that Yahweh has never let his foot slip (66:9[8]; cf. 94:18; 121:3; Job 12:5 [*m'd*]; Dt. 32:35; Jer. 13:16 [*ngp* hiphil]; Ps. 73:2 *Q* [*nṭh*]). The feet of the wicked, however, walk into a snare (Job 18:8); Gerleman considers *b^eraglāyw* an idiomatic expression meaning "immediately" (as in Jgs. 5:15 and possibly also Nu. 20:19; Dt. 2:28; 2 S. 15:16-17; cf. Lam. 1:13; Ps. 9:16[15]; 25:15; Prov. 3:26); terrors chase *(pwṣ)* them *l^eraglāyw,* "at their heels" (Job 18:11).[107] Fohrer envisions the "vengeful spirits of the oppressed and slain, or possibly even demons, which dog the footsteps of the wicked"; citing Arab. *fūdsa* IV, Driver suggests for *pîṣ* the meaning "pass water (on their feet)" out of panic.[108] In Jer. 38:22 the women of the royal court lament that Zedekiah has his feet stuck (*ṭb'* hophal) in the mud — an image of his hopeless situation.

The metaphor of slipping feet probably reflects the theology of creation, which attaches great importance to the firm foundations of the world established by Yahweh. In

101. O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos. BK* XVII (1984), 45.
102. Keel, "Symbolik," 530.
103. F. J. Stendebach, *Glaube bringt Freude* (1982), 99-100.
104. Plöger, *BK* XVII, 64-65.
105. H. Ringgren, *Sprüche. ATD* XVI/1 (1961), 101.
106. Plöger, 310.
107. G. Gerleman, "ברגליו as an Idiomatic Phrase," *JSS* 4 (1959) 59.
108. Fohrer, *KAT* XVI, 302; G. R. Driver, *ZAW* 65 (1953) 259-60.

the Psalter we find a later individualization of statements that originally dealt with a much broader realm.[109]

The psalmist avows that Yahweh's word is a lantern to his feet (Ps. 119:105); it illuminates his whole existence, so that he can see and recognize the path of his life and its goal. His foot stands on level ground (26:12); his entire being is anchored firmly. Yahweh's angels bear up the devout, so that they will not dash their foot against a stone and stumble (91:12; cf. 56:14[13]; 116:8; Prov. 3:23; 1 S. 2:9). Yahweh makes the feet of the king as swift as those of a deer (Ps. 18:34[33] par. 2 S. 22:34; cf. Hab. 3:19). The psalmist declares that Yahweh has set his feet in a broad place (Ps. 31:9[8]); "while *ṣār* denotes constriction, the affliction that chokes off life, *hirḥabtā* is a term associated with the nomadic way of life (Gen. 26:22), conjuring up the expansive liberty of unlimited possibilities."[110] Yahweh has set the psalmist's feet upon a rock (Ps. 40:3[2]). In contrast to the chaotic subterranean realm of the dead, bedrock *(selaʿ)* is the "very essence of firmness and solidity."[111]

Job 13:27 is difficult. Fohrer derives *tāśēm* from *aasîm* II = *śmm* = *smm,* "daub, paint, color," and reads *bassîd,* "with lime, plaster," instead of *bassad,* "in the stocks."[112] He deletes v. 27b as a gloss from 33:11b and interprets *ḥqh* as a by-form of *ḥqq,* "incise." Thus he arrives at the translation: "You daub my feet with lime and draw on the roots of my feet."[113] "It is as though he [God] daubed Job's feet with bright lime so as to observe every single step, as though he drew Job's footprints on the ground so as to trace his paths precisely."[114]

3. *Symbolism.* The symbolism of the foot has to do primarily with sovereignty and subjection.[115] According to Gen. 49:10, the ruler's staff *(mᵉḥōqēq)* shall not depart "from between" the feet of Judah; the reference is to "the staff of office or command of the tribal leader . . . , here standing for predominance in a group of tribes."[116] The position of the staff between Judah's feet emphasizes its inherent symbolic power (cf. Jgs. 5:27). In Jgs. 1:6-7 cutting off the thumbs and big toes *(bᵉhōnôt raglayim)* of the defeated kings symbolizes their loss of power. Victory and defeat are clearly signalized when Ps. 18:39(38) par. 2 S. 22:39 describes the enemy as falling under the feet of the king (cf. the similar formula "under the soles of his feet" in 1 K. 5:17[3]). Ps. 47:4(3) extends this originally royal prerogative to all Israel.[117] According to Isa. 26:6, the arrogance of the lofty city is punished by being trampled *(rms)* by the feet of the lowly. Mal. 3:21 intensifies the symbolism, turning defeat into annihilation.[118] Annihilation is

---

109. → VIII, 157-58.
110. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59,* discussing Ps. 4:2(1); cf. Ps. 18:20(19); 66:12; 118:5.
111. *Ibid.,* 460.
112. Fohrer, *KAT* XVI, 238-39.
113. For a different interpretation see F. Horst, *Hiob. BK* XVI/1 (²1983), 182.
114. Fohrer, *KAT* XVI, 253; on Job 30:12 and 33:11, see *ibid.,* 414, 457.
115. Hentschke, 505; Blatter, 55.
116. Westermann.
117. Görg, 138.
118. U. Rüterswörden, *BN* 2 (1977) 16-22.

also conveyed by the expression "bathe *(rḥṣ)* one's feet in blood" (Ps. 68:24[23]; cf. Dnl. 7:7,19).

The interpretation of Isa. 41:2 is disputed. In the MT the first stich reads *ṣeḏeq yiqrā'ēhû lᵉraglô*, "salvation encounters [*qr'* II] his foot." The reading of 1QIsᵃ is *qr'* I, "call." Elliger finds the dative obj. *lᵉraglô* in addition to the accusative object in the verbal suffix problematic and proposes shifting *lᵉraglô* to the end of the second stich and — on the basis of LXX *poreúsetai* = *wᵉyēlēḵ*, which he emends to *wᵉyuḵal* — replaces the original *lᵉraglô* with *wᵉyuḵal*, "and he triumphs."[119] The text then reads: "Who has roused from the east one whom salvation encounters and who triumphs? He lays low nations and makes kings fall [*yrd* hiphil in 1QIsᵃ] at his feet." If this emendation should be correct, this passage too would be an instance of the foot as a symbol of subjugation.

In Ps. 110:1 Yahweh promises to place the king's enemies as a footstool *(hᵃḏōm)* at his feet. The influence of Egyptian motifs is evident.[120] "Only the God of Israel can entrust the reigning king with that control over the powers of chaos symbolized by the 'enemies' that the Egyptian pharaoh claims to enjoy by virtue of his sense of being the deity's elect."[121] The image of the king's enemies as his footstool is related to the practice of the victors putting their feet on the necks of vanquished rulers (Josh. 10:24).

The foot also appears as a symbol of social oppression (Lam. 3:34 [*dk'* piel] with reference to injustices on the part of the Babylonian occupation forces; Ps. 36:12[11]). The vanquished lick (*lḥk* piel) the dust of the feet of the conqueror (Isa. 49:23) or prostrate themselves at the soles of his feet (Isa. 60:14). The phenomenon of surrender by embracing someone's feet appears in 1 S. 25:24; 2 K. 4:27,37; Est. 8:3. This gesture implies a plea for help and protection as well as consequent gratitude. "The feet are embraced as the basis of the power that the supplicant seeks to move. This manner of exerting power through an (apparent) gesture of submission appears in the OT as a typically feminine action."[122]

Ps. 8:7(6) is of substantial anthropological import: "You have put all things under [human beings'] feet." This text depicts humans not only as sovereigns over the animals but also as their protectors.[123] In Egypt the analogous idiom is used to describe Pharaoh as the protector of Egypt against enemy nations, confirming the power of the king, the exemplary human individual, to establish and preserve order; Ps. 8, however, extends the universal competence of the king to humans in general, as appointed by God, enabling them by virtue of their God-given authority to resist the menace of chaos and to rule over their own environment.[124]

---

119. Elliger, *BK* XI/1, 105.

120. See II.1 above; also L. Dürr, *Ps 110 im Lichte der neueren altorientalischen Forschung* (1929); Keel, *Welt*, 230-33; for a different view, based on untenable dogmatic arguments, see Gössmann, 51 n. 72.

121. Görg, 138.

122. Keel, "Symbolik," 533.

123. Keel, *Welt*, 49-50; Zenger, *Gottes Bogen*, 91.

124. Görg, 134-37; cf. O. H. Steck, *BN* 14 (1981) 59.

The foot also serves as a symbol in the context of (acquiring) property. According to Dt. 2:5, Yahweh will give the Israelites none of the land of the Edomites *'aḏ miḏrak̲ kap̲ rāgel,* "up to a place trodden upon by the sole of a foot," i.e., the breadth of a foot. The occupation of Canaan is described in Dt. 11:24 by the expression: "Every place that the sole of your foot will tread upon shall be yours" (cf. Josh. 1:3; 14:9; 2 K. 21:8; 2 Ch. 33:8). Dt. 11:6 speaks of the destruction of Dathan and Abiram along with *kol hayᵉqûm 'ᵃšer bᵉraglêhem,* "all the substance at their feet," i.e., all their possessions[125] (cf. also Gen. 13:17; Ps. 60:10[8] = 108:10[9]).

Dt. 25:9 bears witness to a legal ceremony requiring the wife of a deceased man whose brother has refused levirate marriage to pull his sandal off his foot in public. Since the sandal reinforces the strength of the foot and thus the possibility of acquiring property, this ceremony signifies a loss of power and respect for the brother of the deceased (cf. Ruth 4:7, where the gesture of removing a sandal and giving it to another symbolizes a waiver of rights).[126]

4. *God.* The anthropomorphic picture of God in the OT makes it possible to speak of God's feet. According to Ex. 24:10, Moses and his companions can see the God of Israel: "Under his feet was something like a pavement of lapis lazuli." It is highly significant that this text, probably late (note the similarity to Ezk. 1),[127] describes only what is touched by God's feet, a reticence that emphasizes God's transcendence. Ps. 18:10(9) par. 2 S. 22:10 (cf. Nah. 1:3) describes a theophany of Yahweh: "Thick darkness was under his feet." These words recall an Akkadian hymn that describes the storm god as arriving mounted on the storm.[128] Here too the text refuses any real description of God: "As the *revelatus* God remains *absconditus*."[129]

Zec. 14:4 describes a theophany in which Yahweh's feet stand on the Mount of Olives, which thereupon splits in two, producing a wide valley, a highway on which Yahweh enters Jerusalem with his saints.[130] The disastrous consequences of a theophany are the subject of Hab. 3:5: the plague *(rešep̲)* follows upon God's feet, a deity reduced to a demon in Yahweh's service.[131]

Isa. 60:13 promises that Yahweh will glorify the place *(māqôm)* where his feet rest, i.e., the Jerusalem temple. A different notion is reflected in Isa. 66:1, where the earth is described as Yahweh's footstool — in polemic opposition to the rebuilding of the temple.[132] Metzger notes that "the throne represents the domain ruled and governed by the one who sits upon it."[133] Since Yahweh established his domain with the creation of

---

125. Helfmeyer, *Nachfolge Gottes,* 75-76.

126. Keel, "Symbolik," 534-35.

127. E. Ruprecht, *Werden und Wirken des ATs. FS C. Westermann* (Göttingen, 1980), 138-73.

128. *AOT,* 249; Kraus, *Psalms 1,* 261.

129. *Ibid.,* 260.

130. J. Jeremias, *Theophanie. WMANT* 10 (^{2}1977), 24.

131. *Ibid.,* 46ff.

132. G. Fohrer, *Archäologie und AT. FS K. Galling* (Tübingen, 1970), 101-16; for a different interpretation see C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1969), 412-13.

133. "Thron," 295.

heaven and earth, with heaven and earth he has set up his throne and his footstool, so that building a temple is otiose. By contrast, Ezk. 43:7 (early exilic[134]) speaks without hesitation of the temple as the place for the soles of Yahweh's feet. This language probably alludes to the ark,[135] even though there is clearly no mention of it by name. May we see here the influence of Jer. 3:16-17? If so, Ezekiel's formulation would occupy a mediating position between the negative verdict of Jeremiah and the positive significance of the ark in P (Ex. 25ff.). Lam. 2:1 speaks of Zion/Jerusalem as the footstool of Yahweh.[136] The additive parallelism of *'ᵃrôn* and *hᵃḏōm* in 1 Ch. 28:2 casts doubt on the supposed identification of the ark with God's footstool there.[137] Fabry therefore suggests interpreting *hᵃḏōm* as equivalent to *kappōreṯ,* the cover of the ark,[138] which since the time of P was considered the "locus of atonement" but was also understood in full symbolic reality as the "representative" of God's living presence.[139]

The alternation between Zion as God's throne (Jer. 14:19,21; Ps. 9:12[11]; 68:17[16]) and God's footstool (Ps. 99:5,9; Lam. 2:1) is consonant with the iconography of the ancient Near East.[140] Worshipers prostrate themselves before the ark as Yahweh's footstool (Ps. 99:5; 132:7). Dt. 33:3 is difficult. In the clause *wᵉhēm tukkû lᵉragleḵā, BHS* proposes emending *tukkû* to *himtakkû* (from *mkk*); the meaning would then be that the holy ones bow down before Yahweh's feet.[141] Komlós, however, sees in *tukkû* a borrowing from Aram. *tikkā'/tîḵā',* "chain," from the root *tkk,* "link, bind." He understands the text to mean that the holy ones fasten themselves like anklets to Yahweh's feet — a concrete image representing an ideal approach.

A different aspect appears when Job avows: "My foot has held fast to his steps (*'āšur*)" (Job 23:11). Here the text expresses the notion of "following" God, implying faithful obedience.

IV. Derivatives.

1. *rāḡal.* The denominative verb *rāḡal* occasionally means "slander" (qal, Ps. 15:3; piel, 2 S. 19:28[27]), more often "spy out" (Gen. 42:30; Num. 21:32; Dt. 1:24; Josh. 6:22,25; 7:2 [twice]; 14:7; Jgs. 18:2,14,17; 2 S. 10:3; 1 Ch. 19:3). The piel ptcp. *mᵉraggēl* denotes a spy (Gen. 42:9,11,14,16,31,34; Josh. 2:1; 6:23; 1 S. 26:4; 2 S. 15:10). "A person whose feet are all too busy was considered a spy."[142] The form *tirgaltî* (Hos. 11:3)[143] may be related to Arab. *rǧl,* "suckle, nurse."

---

134. B. Janowski, *JBTh* 2 (1987) 168.
135. Contra *ibid.,* 172.
136. Contra H.-J. Kraus, *Klagelieder. BK* XX (^{3}1983), 41.
137. Metzger, *Königsthron,* 358-59.
138. → Fabry, III, 332-34.
139. J. Blank, *Theologie zur Zeit* 1 (Düsseldorf, 1986) 46-48.
140. Metzger, "Wohnstatt," 156.
141. F. Stummer, *Alttestamentliche Studien. FS F. Nötscher. BBB* 1 (1950), 265-70; Helfmeyer, *Nachfolge Gottes,* 104-5.
142. Keel, "Symbolik," 530.
143. See I above.

2. *marg^elôṯ*. The noun *marg^elôṯ*, "foot end, feet," appears in Ruth 3:4,7,8,14; the sexual connotations of the expressions are unmistakable.[144] Dnl. 10:6 describes the "feet" of the angel as gleaming like bronze.

3. *raglî*. The noun *raglî*, "one on foot," appears in Ex. 12:37 and Nu. 11:21. It refers to foot soldiers in Jgs. 20:2; 1 S. 4:10; 15:4; 2 S. 8:4; 10:6; 1 K. 20:29; 2 K. 13:7; 1 Ch. 18:4; 19:18. The figurative question in Jer. 12:5 deserves special mention: "If you race with foot-runners and they have wearied *(l'h)* you, how will you compete with horses?" — lit.: "If you can't carry out an easy assignment, what will happen when the hard ones come?"[145]

4. *r^egālîm*. The pl. *r^egālîm* can mean "times," alternating with *p^eʿāmîm* (Ex. 23:14; Nu. 22:28,32,33).

V. Deuterocanonical Texts. Gk. *poús* denotes the foot in Tob. 6:2 (twice); 11:10; Jdt. 10:4; Sir. 26:18; 38:29,30; Bar. 6:17; 1 Mc. 5:48.

In the context of polemic against idols, Wis. 15:15 states that the feet of idols are of no use for walking (cf. Bar. 6:25; Ps. 115:7).[146]

In 1 Mc. 9:16 *poús* is used figuratively: the enemy troops turned and followed *katá pódas,* "in the footsteps," of Judas, i.e., close behind. Wis. 9:16 says that only with great labor can one find what lies "before one's feet" (NRSV "at hand"). Idols have become a snare for the feet of the foolish (Wis. 14:11). Sir. 6:24 admonishes disciples to put their feet into the fetters of instruction (but cf. 21:19 [LXX B]). Sir. 6:25 (= LXX 6:36) urges disciples to let their feet wear out the doorstep of an intelligent person. A man's footsteps reveal what kind of man he is (19:30 [LXX S^2]). The foot of a fool rushes into a house, while an experienced person waits respectfully outside (21:22). In 51:15 (LXX H^a) the author avers that his foot has walked on the straight path. Finally, 40:25 states that gold and silver provide a firm footing, but good counsel is esteemed more than either. Sir. 25:20 (H) uses a vivid simile: "A sandy ascent for the feet of the aged — such is a garrulous wife to a quiet husband": both are equally tiresome.

The symbolism of sovereignty and subjugation appears in Jdt. 2:7. In a similar vein, prostration is a gesture of subservience and homage (Jdt. 14:7; Est. 4:17d). Conversely, the text can state that the soles *(íchnos)* of the enemies' feet will not be able to withstand the Assyrians' attack (Jdt. 6:4).[147] In Sir. 4:28 (H; cf. 5:14 LXX), the qal of *rāg̱al* appears with the meaning "slander."

VI. Dead Sea Scrolls. In 1QM 5:13 we find the form *m^erûggeleṯ*, probably a pual ptcp. of *rgl* with the meaning "sword belt."

---

144. E. Zenger, *ZBK* 8, 67.
145. W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* XII (1968), 79.
146. H. D. Preuss, *Verspottung fremder Religionen im AT. BWANT* 92 (1971), 264-67.
147. Or "footprints" (NRSV), as proposed by E. Zenger, *JSHRZ* I, 476; cf. 1 Mc. 10:72.

As a term for the "foot" of a human being or animal, *regel* appears in 1QM 6:12; 1QSa 2:5; 11QT 48:4-5; 61:12; 1QS 6:13; 10:13.

Closely connected with the metaphorical language of the Psalms are 1QH 2:29; 7:25 (cf. Ps. 26:12); 4:3 (cf. Ps. 40:3[2]); 7:2 (cf. Jer. 38:22); 8:34 (cf. Ps. 105:18); this last passage also uses a new expression: "There are no footfalls to the tread of my feet." The foot as a symbol of sovereignty and subjugation appears in 1QM 12:11; 19:3.

In an interpretation of the saying concerning Judah in Gen. 49:10, 4QPatr 3 identifies the feet between which the ruler's staff lies with the thousands of Israel.

In the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, *regel* appears twice, in totally obscure contexts (4Q403 1, 2:2; 4Q406 6, 3).

We find *rgl* in the Aramaic texts in 11QTgJob 12:1; 14:10; 22:5 (cf. Job 33:11); and in 1QapGen 20:5, in the description of Sarai's beauty.[148]

Stendebach

148. J. A. Fitzmyer and D. J. Harrington, *Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts. BietOr* 34 (1978).

רָגַם *rāgam;* רֶגֶם *regem;* רִגְמָה *rigmâ;* מַרְגֵּמָה *margēmâ*

I. 1. Etymology; 2. Distribution; 3. LXX. II. Legal Use. III. Narrative Use. IV. Nouns.

I. 1. *Etymology.* The root *rgm* appears in the OT as both verb and noun. It is found also in Akkadian and Ugaritic, as well as in Jewish Aramaic, Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic. In Hebrew, Jewish Aramaic, and Syriac, its only meaning is "throw stones, stone"; in Arabic, however, it also means "curse," the only meaning associated with the root in Ethiopic. The question of a relationship with Akk. *ragāmu,* "cry out," and *rigmu,* "cry, voice," must remain open. Possibly Ugar. *rgm,* "send," and *rgm(t),* "mes-

rāgam. H. J. Boecker, *Redeformen des Rechtslebens im AT. WMANT* 14 (1964), esp. 147-49; G. R. Driver, "Studies in the Vocabulary of the OT, IV," *JTS* 33 (1931/32) 38-47; J. Gabriel, "Die Todesstrafe im Licht des ATs," *Theologische Fragen der Gegenwart. FS T. Innitzer* (Vienna, 1952), 69-79; R. Hirzel, "Die Strafe der Steinigung," *ASGW Phil.-hist. Kl.* 27 (1909), 223-66; G. Liedke, *Gestalt und Bezeichnung alttestamentlicher Rechtssätze. WMANT* 39 (1971), esp. 49-50; O. Michel, "Steinigung," *BHHW,* III, 1861-62; F. Praetorius, "Äthiopische Etymologien," *ZDMG,* 61 (1907), 615-24, esp. 620-21; G. Rinaldi, *"Rigmâ," BiOr* 26 (1984) 124; H. Schüngel-Straumann, "Tod und Leben in der Gesetzesliteratur des Pentateuch" (diss., Bonn, 1969); R. de Vaux, *AncIsr,* I, esp. 159.

sage, report," preserve the basic meaning of the root ("send forth"), which in Hebrew developed a specialized association with the object "stone."

2. *Distribution.* The root and its derivatives occur 19 times in the OT: 15 times as a verb in the qal, once each in the forms *margēmâ* (Prov. 26:8) and *rigmāṯām* (Ps. 68:28 [Eng. 27]), and twice as a proper name (1 Ch. 2:47; Zec. 7:2). Probably, though, the PN *reḡem meleḵ* in Zec. 7:2 and the hapax legomenon *rigmāṯām* in Ps. 68:28(27) should be emended: the former (with Syr.) to *raḇ mag hammeleḵ*[1] and the latter to *raḇ mᵉṯîm.*[2]

Except in Lev. 24:14,16, the verb is always associated with the noun *'eḇen,* "stone," in the singular or plural, either in the accusative or linked with the prep. *bᵉ*. In contrast to the OT synonym → סקל *sāqal, rāgam* occurs almost exclusively in exilic and postexilic texts.

3. *LXX.* The LXX translates the verb with *lithoboleín* except in Nu. 14:10, which uses *katalithoboleín.* The noun *margēmâ* is translated with *sphendónē,* "sling," which suggests a similar translation of the hapax legomenon in Prov. 26:8.[3]

II. Legal Use. The verb is used in the context of legal ordinances in Lev. 20:2,27; 24:14,16,23; Nu. 15:35-36; Dt. 21:21 (cf. 11QT 64:5). Here it denotes more precisely the means of execution provided for capital punishment of certain offenses: blasphemy (Lev. 24:14,16,23), desecration of the sabbath (Nu. 15:35-36), the sacrifice of children to Moloch (Lev. 20:2), soothsaying (Lev. 20:27), and rebellion against one's parents (Dt. 21:21). In many instances the requirement of stoning is preceded by the customary death-sentence formula *môṯ yûmāṯ* (Lev. 20:2,27; 24:16; Nu. 15:35). Sometimes the text explicitly mentions the resulting death (Nu. 15:36; Dt. 21:21; Lev. 24:23 [Syr.]). The condemned individual was taken outside the camp or village, the witnesses for the prosecution laid their hands on his head (Lev. 24:14), and then the people present hurled stones until the victim died. This procedure also lent expression to the collective nature of the punishment. As a further mark of dishonor and as a deterrent, the corpse might be hung on a tree; but it had to be removed before nightfall to keep the land from becoming ritually defiled (Dt. 21:22-23).[4]

III. Narrative Use. The use of *rāgam* in narrative texts is entirely consonant with its use in legal contexts. Here too the subject is always stoning by a crowd as an intended or actual means of execution. In this context, however, one must distinguish between the stoning demanded by a particular ordinance and simple lynch law. By refusing to carry out the ban totally (Josh. 7:25), Achan disobeys a legal requirement; similarly, an adulteress transgresses a specific law (Ezk. 16:40; 23:47). But the stonings of Adoniram (1 K. 12:18; 2 Ch. 10:18) and Zechariah son of Jehoiada (2 Ch.

---

1. E. Sellin, *Das Zwölfprophetenbuch. KAT* XII (^{2,3}1929-1930), 528; cf. *BHS.*
2. H. Gunkel, *Psalmen. HKAT* II/2 (^{5}1968), 291.
3. O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos. BK* XVII (1984), 306-7, 311.
4. → תלה *tālâ.*

24:21) are simply emotional responses without any legal basis. Neither is there any legal basis for the threat of the disenchanted Israelites to stone Joshua and Caleb (Nu. 14:10), which in the event was not carried out.

IV. Nouns. As the LXX and Plöger suggest,[5] the noun *margēmâ,* preceded by *'eben* (Prov. 26:8), refers to a sling used as a weapon; it thus incorporates the basic meaning of the root: "send forth, hurl." The maxim in Prov. 26:8 uses the image of a stone bound tightly in a sling to represent the irrationality of honoring a fool.

The basic meaning of the root is probably also present in the nominal derivatives *regem,* used as a proper name (1 Ch. 2:47), referring to a person or village in Calebite territory.

Schunck

5. Plöger, *BK* XVII, 306-7, 311.

רֶגַע *rega';* רגע *rg';* רָגֵעַ *rāgēa';* מַרְגּוֹעַ *margôa';* מַרְגֵּעָה *margē'â*

I. Etymology. II. Semantic Field. III. Usage. IV. LXX and Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Etymology. The etymological problems associated with the Biblical Hebrew noun *rega',* "moment, brief space of time," occasionally "rest," have found no definitive solution. Earlier scholars sought to distinguish two or even three distinct roots *rg'* in Biblical Hebrew;[1] most scholars today are inclined to identify only a single root *rg'.*[2]

rega'. J. Barr, *Biblical Words for Time. SBT* 1/33 (²1969); H. Brunner, "Zum Zeitbegriff der Ägypter," *Studium Generale* 8 (1955) 584-90; D. Daube, *The Sudden in the Scriptures* (Leiden, 1964); G. Harder, "σπουδάζω," *TDNT,* VII, 559-68; S. Herrmann, *Time and History* (Eng. trans. Nashville, 1981); L. Kopf, "Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch," *VT* 8 (1958) 161-215, esp. 202-3; C. von Orelli, *Die hebräischen Synonyma der Zeit und Ewigkeit genetisch und sprachvergleichend dargestellt* (Leipzig, 1871); E. Otto, "Altägyptische Zeitvorstellungen und Zeitbegriffe," *Die Welt als Geschichte* 14 (1954) 135-48; M. Perani, "Rilievi sulla terminologia temporale nel libro di *Giobbe,*" *Henoch* 5 (1983) 1-20; G. Robinson, "The Idea of Rest in the OT and the Search for the Basic Character of the Sabbath," *ZAW* 92 (1980) 32-42, esp. 33, 41.

→ עת *'ēṯ;* → פתאם *piṯ'ōm.*

1. For two see, e.g., *GesB,* 745-46; for three, e.g., *BDB,* 920-21.

2. E.g., W. L. Holladay, *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the OT* (Grand Rapids, 1971), 332-33.

Suggested cognates include above all Arab. *rağa'a,* "return,"[3] and Eth. *rag'a,* "come together, contract,"[4] and occasionally a metathesis of Arab. *ra'ağa,* "disturb," VII "do in haste."[5] To all appearances, most OT occurrences can be derived from the concrete notion of a "blink of an eye" (cf. esp. the Arab. expression *ka-rağ' al-baṣar,* "in the twinkling of an eye"[6]). The noun thus appears comparable in meaning to Egyp. *'n.t,* "moment," which is actually written with the hieroglyph for "eye."[7]

In the OT the root *rg'* appears not only in the nominal derivatives *rega'* (22 times), **rāgēa',* "living quietly" (Ps. 35:20), *margôa',* "rest" (Jer. 6:16), and *margē'â,* "rest" (Isa. 28:12), but also as a verb: in the qal, "still" (Job 26:12; Isa. 51:15 par. Jer. 31:35 [according to some, e.g., NRSV: "stir up"]); in the niphal, "be quiet" (Jer. 47:6), rarely "harden" (of skin); in the hiphil, "be at rest, live quietly" (Dt. 28:65; Isa. 34:14; Sir. 36:31) or "cause to rest" (Isa. 51:4; Jer. 31:2; 50:34), but also "do in a moment," presumably denominatively from *rega'* (Jer. 49:19 par. 50:44; Prov. 12:19; cf. Job 20:5). The verb *rāga'* survives in rabbinic literature, as well as the nouns *margô'â* (= Biblical Heb. *margē'â*) and *rega'.*[8] There we also find Aram. *rig'â/rîg'â* (= Heb. *rega'*).

II. Semantic Field. In OT Hebrew, *rega'* normally means "moment" (e.g., Ex. 33:5) or "in a moment, suddenly" (Isa. 47:9; cf. *lirgā'îm,* "every moment"). Consequently it can a mean a "short length of time" in general (e.g., Isa. 54:8; Jer. 18:7ff.). Only in one passage may it mean "rest, peace" (Job 21:13).

In the context of OT temporal terminology,[9] *rega'* is not among the relatively general words such as → מוֹעֵד *mô'ēḏ,* "appointed time, date," "festival," and → עֵת *'ēṯ,* "(point in) time, occasion, period, time"; cf. also **'ōpen,* "proper time" (Prov. 25:11); *'ᵉšûn,* "beginning" (Prov. 20:20 *Q;* cj. 7:9); *zᵉman,* "proper time, hour" (Eccl. 3:1; Est. 9:27,31; Neh. 2:6; Sir. 43:7); also Biblical Aram. *zᵉman* (11 times) and *'iddān,* "(appointed) time." Neither is it among the expressions that denote a specific point in the flow of time, e.g., → אחרית *'aḥᵃrîṯ,* "end, terminus; future"; → עד *'aḏ,* "enduring future"; → עולם *'ôlām,* "long duration, endurance"; → קדם *qeḏem,* "ancient time, aforetime"; → קץ *qēṣ,* "end, end time"; and → ראש *rō'š,* "beginning." Like Biblical Heb. *peṯa',* "moment" (Nu. 6:9; 35:22; Isa. 29:5; 30:13; Hab. 2:7; Prov. 6:15; 29:1),[10] and its probable derivative → פתאם *piṯ'ōm,*[11] as well as Biblical Aram. *šā'â,* "moment, short time"[12] (Dnl. 3:6,15; 4:16,30 [Eng. 19,33]; 5:5), *rega'* denotes the briefest possible period of time: the "moment" that arrives suddenly and vanishes instantly (cf. the two Egyptian terms for "moment": one means lit. the "twinkling of an eye"; the other

---

3. Lane, I/3, 1037-42.
4. *LexLingAeth,* 317.
5. R. Dozy, *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes,* II (^{2}1927), 591-92; cf. *GesTh,* 1264-65.
6. Lane.
7. Otto, 139 n. 17.
8. Jastrow, 835, 1450.
9. See esp. Barr, Herrmann, and von Orelli.
10. *HAL,* III, 991.
11. *BLe,* §65y-b′; L. Kopf, *VT* 9 (1959) 271-72.
12. *LexHebAram,* 173.

refers to the time it takes a hippopotamus to surface for air[13]). This explains why *rega',* like *pitʾōm* and *peṯa',* can also be used adverbially in the sense of "suddenly" (cf. also *mᵉhērâ,* "hastily").[14]

III. Usage. Like → פתאם *pitʾōm* and *peṯa', rega'* occurs primarily in the Prophets (3 times each in Isa. 40–55 and Jeremiah, twice each in Isa. 1–39 and Ezekiel) and wisdom literature (4 times in Job, once in Lamentations); it also occurs 3 times in Psalms, twice in Numbers, and once each in Exodus and Ezra.

In most cases, as Daube has shown, the events qualified by *rega'* are negative, threatening, or baleful in nature; they affect either God's enemies, the enemies of God's people, or sinful Israel, collectively or individually. In a few instances, though, *rega'* occurs in positive contexts.

The OT statements about sudden events in human life or the history of a people are strongly shaped by a combination of sapiential experience and faith in God. Experience shows that everything can be turned upside down in an instant, just as human life bears the stamp of its brief duration. But the fugitive nature of human existence is combined with a knowledge of being watched in every detail and at every moment by the Creator, the God of Israel, present and active. Job expresses this sense perfectly: "What are human beings, that you make so much of them, that you set your mind on them, visit them every morning, test them every moment *(lirgāʿîm)?*" (Job 7:17-18). Therefore the exulting of the wicked is short *(miqqārôḇ),* and the joy of the godless is but for a moment (*ʿᵃḏê-rāga',* 20:5); they go down to Sheol suddenly (*bᵉrega',* 21:13; or: "in peace"). But the same fate awaits all, even the mighty: "In a moment *(rega')* they die, at midnight the people are shaken and pass away, and the mighty are taken away by no human hand. For his eyes are upon the ways of mortals, and he sees all their steps" (34:20-21). The paradigmatic example is sinful Sodom, "which was overthrown in a moment *(kᵉmô-rāga'),* though no hand was laid upon it" (Lam. 4:6).

This same perspective pervades OT prophecy. Jeremiah summarizes this observation in an oracle: "At one moment *(rega')* I may declare concerning a nation or a kingdom, that I will pluck up and break down and destroy it. . . . And at another moment *(rega')* I may declare concerning a nation or a kingdom that I will build and plant it" (Jer. 18:7,9). But Yahweh retains his sovereign power to transform the threat or promise into its opposite, because his eye is always on his people. For example, the Isaiah Apocalypse declares that Yahweh is merciful to his people Israel: when Yahweh's wrath comes upon his people, they are to go into hiding "for a little while" *(kimʿaṭ-rega'),* until the wrath is past (Isa. 26:20). Fundamentally, Israel remains Yahweh's pleasant vineyard, which he waters every moment *(lirgāʿîm)* and guards night and day (27:3).

In the visions of Jeremiah against Judah, it is revealed that the whole land is to be laid waste: "Suddenly *(piṯʾōm)* my tents are destroyed, my curtains in a moment

13. Otto, 139; Brunner.
14. *IBHS,* §39.3.1j.

(rega')" (Jer. 4:20). Ezk. 26:1-21 threatens that, with the fall of Tyre, all the princes of the coastlands shall step down from their thrones: "they shall tremble every moment *(lirgā'îm)*" (v. 16; or: "tremble in agitation"[15]); the fate of Egypt also makes many peoples and their kings "tremble every moment *(lirgā'îm)*" (32:10).

In the exilic period Deutero-Isaiah sees it as a visionary certainty that disaster will soon befall Babylon, "in a moment, on the same day" *(rega' b^{e}yôm 'eḥāḏ*, Isa. 47:9). But whereas disaster befalls Babylon suddenly and conclusively, Yahweh has abandoned his people only "for a brief moment" *(b^{e}rega' qāṭōn)* and hidden his face from them only for a "moment" *(rega')* (54:7-8); he will soon restore them in his great compassion.

In the context of the pre-P Sinai narrative (Ex. 19–24; 32–34),[16] we find Yahweh describing Israel as a stiff-necked people: "If for a single moment *(rega' 'eḥāḏ)* I should go up among you, I would consume you" (Ex. 33:5). And the story of Korah's rebellion (Nu. 16–17) twice describes how Yahweh suddenly *(k^{e}rāga')* consumes his enemies: first Korah and his supporters (16:21), then the murmuring congregation of Israel (17:10 [16:45]).

Similar observations have left their mark on the Psalms. Ps. 6:11(10) declares that all who have been afflicting the oppressed "shall be put to shame in a moment *(rg')*."[17] In Ps. 30 the psalmist affirms that Yahweh's anger lasts but for a moment (v. 6[5])[18] — or is *rega'* (read *rōgez?*) here an antonym to *ḥayyîm* in the sense of "a (happy) life," i.e., "anxiety" or the like? According to Ps. 73, an autobiographically stylized didactic poem, the wicked[19] are destroyed in a moment *(k^{e}rāga')* (v. 19).

Using the term in a positive sense, Ezra affirms that "now, for a brief moment" *(w^e'attâ kim'aṭ-rega')* Yahweh has shown favor to his people Israel, by vouchsafing them the overwhelming experience of rebuilding the temple under the protection of the Persian Empire (Ezr. 9:8).

IV. LXX and Dead Sea Scrolls. The LXX translates the noun *rega'* in a variety of ways: *spoudḗ* (Lam. 4:6),[20] *péras* (Jer. 18:7,9), *diá táchous* (Ps. 6:11[10]), but also *anápausis* (Job 7:18; 21:13); it translates *k^{e}rāga'* with *eis hápax* (Nu. 16:21,45[17:10]) and *kim'aṭ-rega'* with *mikrón hóson hóson* (Isa. 26:20).

The noun *rega'* has not been found in the Dead Sea Scrolls; the verb *rg'* hiphil, "disturb," appears in 4Q184 1,12.

Kronholm

---

15. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 30; cf. D. M. Goldmann, *ABR* 4 (1954/55) 15.

16. R. Smend, *Die Entstehung des ATs* (Stuttgart, 1978), 66ff.

17. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1988), 160; see 163-64 for a discussion of the text.

18. *Ibid.*, 355.

19. → רשׁע *rāšā'*.

20. Harder, 563.

רָדָה rāḏâ; רָדָה rāḏâ II; רָדַד rāḏaḏ

I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences; 3. LXX. II. Meaning: 1. Lexical Field; 2. Secular Usage; 3. Religious Usage; 4. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. 1. *Etymology.* The root *rdh* is Common Semitic. It appears in Akkadian (*redû* and *radādu*, "pursue"[1]), Syriac (*rd'*), Arabic (*rdy*), Aramaic (*rd'* or *rdy*[2]), and Hebrew. The root *rdd* is thought to be related; it occurs in Jewish Aramaic and Modern Hebrew as well as in Biblical Hebrew. A root *rd*[3] or *drd*[4] occurs in one Ugaritic text;[5] whether it has anything to do with our root is not clear.

2. *Occurrences.* The verb *rāḏâ* occurs 27 times in the OT. The lexicons distinguish two roots: *rdh* I, "rule," with 24 occurrences, and *rdh* II, "take, seize," with 3. In addition, the root *rd* appears 3 times in the OT. There are also 4 occurrences of *rdh* and 2 of *rdd* in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The distribution of occurrences among the individual books and groups of books reveals no particular concentration: *rdh* I: Genesis 2, Leviticus 4, Numbers and Deuteronomy 1 each, 1 Kings 3, Isaiah 3, Ezekiel 2, Joel 1, Psalms 4, Lamentations, Nehemiah, and 2 Chronicles 1 each; *rdh* II: Judges 2, Jeremiah 1; *rdd:* 1 each in 1 Kings, Isaiah, and Psalms.

3. *LXX.* The translations used by the LXX are so varied that they themselves illuminate the problems involved in semantic analysis: there are 4 occurrences of *árchein* (Gen. 1:26,28; 1 K. 5:4[Eng. 4:24]) or *katárchein* (Neh. 9:28); the translation *kyrieúein* (Isa. 14:2) or *katakyrieúein* (Ps. 49:15[14]; 72:8; 110:2) also occurs 4 times. Then there are 3 occurrences of *katateínein* (Lev. 25:43,46,56) and 1 of *diṓkein* (Lev. 26:17) and the related *ergodiōkteín* (2 Ch. 8:10). Other translations appear only once: *ékstasis* (Ps. 68:28[27]), *exegeírein* (Nu. 24:19), *existánai* (Isa. 41:2); *epikrateín* (1 K. 9:23); *epistátēs* (1 K. 5:30[16]), *katágein* (Lam. 1:13), *katergázesthai* (Ezk. 34:4), *paíein* (Isa.

---

rāḏâ. B. S. Childs, *OT Theology in a Canonical Context* (Philadelphia, 1986); K. Koch, "Gestaltet die Erde, doch heget das Leben!" *"Wenn nicht jetzt, wann dann?" FS H.-J. Kraus* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1983), 23-36; N. Lohfink, "'Macht euch die Erde untertan!'" *Orientierung* 38 (1974) 137-42; *idem,* "Growth," *Great Themes from the OT* (Eng. trans. Edinburgh, 1982), 167-82; G. von Rad, *ThAT,* I (⁶1969); G. Rinaldi, *"rdh (rd')," BeO* 21 (1979) 78; W. H. Schmidt, *Die Schöpfungsgeschichte der Priesterschrift. WMANT* 17 (²1967); H. Wildberger, "Das Abbild Gottes," *Jahwe und sein Volk. GSAT. ThB* 66 (1979), 110-45 (repr. from *TZ* 21 [1965] 245-59, 481-501); H. W. Wolff, *Anthropology of the OT* (Eng. trans. Philadelphia, 1974); W. Zimmerli, *Grundriss der alttestamentlichen Theologie. TW* 3 (⁵1985).

1. *AHw,* II, 940-41.
2. Beyer, 692.
3. *WUS,* no. 2492.
4. *UT,* no. 700.
5. *KTU,* 1.10, III, 6.

14:6), *paradidónai* (Dt. 20:20), *pateín* (Joel 4:13[3:13]), and *pleíōn* (Ezk. 29:15). In Ps. 68:28(27) the translation "in ecstasy" gives the impression that the LXX has interpreted the text very differently. In the case of *katágein* and possibly *exegeírein,* the LXX appears to have read the root *yrd,* and in the case of *exístēmi,* the hiphil of *ḥrd.*

The LXX translates *rdh* II with *exaireín* (Jgs. 14:9 [twice]) and *epikrateín* (Jer. 5:31). For *rdd* it uses *epakoúein* (Isa. 45:1), *katabaínein* (1 K. 6:32), and *hypotithénai* (Ps. 144:2).

II. Meaning.

1. *Lexical Field.* Jgs. 14:9 uses the root *rdh* II twice in connection with the honey that Samson finds in the body of the lion and "removes." The occurrence in Jer. 5:31 more likely involves *rdh* I.

To approach the question of the semantic content of the root *rdh* I with great caution, we shall first examine its grammatical relationships. First, we observe that *rdh* usually has a personal subject; it therefore denotes an action performed by a human agent. The subject may be the priests (Jer. 5:31), an alien, an Israelite, or all Israel (Lev. 25:43,46,53; Dt. 20:20; Isa. 14:2), a supervisor (1 K. 5:30[16]; 9:23; 2 Chr. 8:10), the tribe of Benjamin (Ps. 68:28[27]), or Egypt (Ezk. 29:15). Other subjects include shepherds (Ezk. 34:4), enemies (Neh. 9:28; Lev. 26:17), and human beings in general (Joel 4:13[3:13]), as well as the king of Israel (Ps. 72:8; 110:2) or of Babylon (Isa. 14:6), Cyrus (Isa. 41:2), and the ruler out of Jacob (Nu. 24:19). Ps. 49:15(14) speaks figuratively of personified death and its dominion.

The answer to the question of the object of this human action is equally clear: in the vast majority of cases, the objects are human individuals or groups: nations (Isa. 14:2,6; 45:1; Ezk. 29:15; Ps. 144:2) or their kings (Isa. 41:2), enemies (Ps. 110:2; cf. Nu. 24:19), Israel (Lev. 26:17; 1 K. 5:30[16]; 9:23; 2 Ch. 8:10), tribes (Ps. 68:28[27]), the city of Jerusalem (Lam. 1:13), an enemy city (Dt. 20:20), or an enslaved debtor (Lev. 25:43,46,53). This usage does not differ when Ps. 72:8 describes a dominion "from sea to sea" and 1 K. 5:4(4:24) speaks of "all." Only two texts diverge: in Joel 4:13(3:13) the object of *rdh* is the winepress; in Gen. 1:26,28, it is the (earth and) the whole animal kingdom.

The OT provides no explicit synonyms (but cf. *mšl*[6]), and so there is no help from this source. Only a few associated expressions provide hints concerning the semantic content of *rdh.* In Ps. 110:2 the statement that Yahweh will send *(šlḥ)* the scepter of the king forth from Zion is associated with a command to the king to begin his *rdh* activity in the midst of his foes. This verse is related semantically to v. 1, which speaks of laying the king's enemies at his feet. Our verse goes on to speak of the dominion of the king of Jerusalem over the hostile nations. Ps. 72:8 is similar: the king's *rdh* activity extends from sea to sea and from the River to the ends of the earth; as a consequence his foes bow down before him and lick the dust (v. 9). This text, too, deals with the dominion of the Jerusalem king over the nations of the contemporary world. Our verb thus expresses such royal dominion over foreign or hostile nations. Lam. 1:13 also falls into this category. Vv. 13-15 describe the distress of Jerusalem; Yahweh has sent *(šlḥ)*

---

6. → IX, 68-69.

fire from on high and thus "dominated" the city, chastising, punishing, devastating it as though it were an enemy. The image of feet caught in a net (v. 13b) further reinforces the statement. Here, as in Ps. 110:2, *rdh* is the result of *šlḥ;* the consequences of such "dominion" are highly disagreeable for those affected.

Here it is appropriate to discuss a special problem associated with the root *rdh.* In Lam. 1:13 the LXX translates the word *wayyirdennâ* with *katēgagen autó,* a translation that suggests a form of the root *yrd;*[7] following this lead, Weiser reads the hiphil of *yrd:* "from on high he sent fire, he made it go down into my bones."[8] Although this emendation is not persuasive, it does illustrate a remarkable tendency in the OT to confuse the roots *rdh* I (and II), *rdd,* and *yrd.* As regards *rdd,* in 1 K. 6:32 (as Noth has shown[9]) we are dealing with a technical term describing the overlaying of the cherubim and palm trees with hammered gold; the vocalization *wayyāreḏ* could also be interpreted as a hiphil form from *rûḏ.* Isa. 45:1 says of Cyrus that Yahweh has grasped him by the right hand to "cast down" nations and open doors before him. The infinitive construct is *lᵉraḏ.* Elliger comments: "The vocalization is unusual. The form probably represents the qal infinitive construct of *rdd* . . . ; it can hardly be the hiphil infinitive construct of *yrd* . . . , as Wellhausen proposed."[10] Since the obj. *gôyim* is characteristic of *rdh,* that verb should also be considered.

As to the similarities of *rdh* to the root *yrd,* the vocalization *rᵉḏēh* in Ps. 110:2, *rᵉḏû* in Joel 4:13(3:13), and *yard* in Isa. 41:2 are entirely consonant with derivation from *yrd;* similarly, *wᵉʾôrîḏ* in Isa. 10:13 is clearly the hiphil of *yrd,* and does not need to be emended to *wāʾērḏ:*[11] "I [the king of Babylon] have brought down those who sat on thrones." The lexical field of the context, however, suggests *rdh* in Ps. 110:2: "Rule in the midst of your foes."

The two remaining texts are difficult. The reading of 1QIs[a] for Isa. 41:2 is *yôrîḏ;* Elliger described the MT form *yrd* as a hiphil of *yrd* apocopated for no apparent reason: "he [Cyrus] brings down kings."[12] The other possibility, requiring just a slight alteration of the vocalization to *yārōḏ,* is derivation from *rdd:* "he subjugates."[13] In Joel 4:13(3:13) Rudolph finds *rdd,* the Vulg. *yrd.*[14] And the expression *yirdû ʿal-yᵉḏêhem* in Jer. 5:31 could mean either "the priests rule by their own authority" or "the priests stand alongside them [the prophets]."[15]

2. *Secular Usage.* In order to establish as solid a basis as possible, our analysis of secular usage will begin where most of the texts using *rdh* appear to be concentrated:

---

7. See *BHS.*

8. A. Weiser, *Klagelieder. ATD* XVI/2 ([3]1992), 309; cf. NRSV.

9. M. Noth, *Könige. BK* IX/1 (1983), 102.

10. K. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja. BK* XI/1 (1989), 481.

11. As proposed by H. Torczyner, *Die Bundeslade und die Anfänge der Religion Israels* (Berlin, 1930), 19-20; cf. *KBL*[2], 875.

12. Elliger, *BK* XI/1, 106.

13. Ewald, Duhm, Volz, and also Westermann (cited by Elliger).

14. W. Rudolph, *Joel, KAT* XIII/2 (1971), 78.

15. See, for the former, A. Weiser, *Jeremia 1–25. ATD* XX (1981), 43; for the latter, *Zürcher Bibel;* cf. NRSV; for other possibilities see W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* XII (1968), 42.

statements concerning kings.[16] In these contexts *rdh* is usually constructed with *b*ᵉ. We are told that Solomon "had dominion over all the region west of the Euphrates" (1 K. 5:4[4:24]). One way in which Yahweh gives assistance to his agent is to "cast down nations before him and rule over kings" (Isa. 41:2, *rdh* with acc.). In a political dirge taunting the king of Babylon, his tyranny is described by the statement: "he struck the peoples in wrath and ruled the nations in anger" (Isa. 14:6). When Egypt's fortunes are restored, the Egyptians will dwell once more in their land, but without oppressing other peoples; for "I will make them so small that they will never again rule over the nations" (Ezk. 29:15). With its summons to the king to "rule in the midst of [his] foes," Ps. 110:2 reflects this usage, as does Ps. 72:8 with its promise that Solomon will "have dominion from sea to sea." These texts reflect the ideal of the universal dominion of the Davidides;[17] Nu. 24:19 looks forward to one out of Jacob who will have dominion over his enemies and destroy those who have escaped from the cities.

The prominent role of the root *rdh* in royal language explains both the use of the root for all kinds of supremacy and its frequent association with acts of violence, linked in part with the motif of anger: the superintendency of Solomon's chief supervisors is described as dominion over the people (1 K. 5:30[16]; 9:23; 2 Ch. 8:10: in each instance *rdh* with *b*ᵉ). The Dtn law governing war speaks of the military conquest of a city (Dt. 20:20, *rdh* with suf.). And the wickedness of the Israelites had the historical consequence that Yahweh abandoned them to the hands of their enemies, who had dominion over them (Neh. 9:28, *rdh* with *b*ᵉ). The meaning of "the upright will have dominion of them [*rdh* with *b*ᵉ] in the morning" (Ps. 49:15[14]) remains unclear.

The observation that a king's dominion over the nations, like any kind of dominion over individuals or groups, can involve the use of force finds various forms of expression. The curses concluding the Holiness Code include a reference to the military defeat of the Israelites: their foes will rule over them and put them to flight (Lev. 26:17, *rdh* with *b*ᵉ). In Isa. 14:6 the striking of the peoples and the ruling of the nations are linked with the wrath *('eḇrâ)* and anger *('aḇ)* of the Babylonian king. And Ezekiel accuses the wicked shepherds of ruling with force *(b*ᵉ*ḥozqâ)* and harshness *(b*ᵉ*p̄ārek̲)* instead of caring for the weak and sick and seeking the strayed and lost (Ezk. 34:4).

The Ezekiel passage, however, probably suggests that dominion does not inherently require force, because the wicked shepherd is contrasted with the good shepherd, who exercises his dominion for the benefit of the flock. This contrast implies that the exercise of dominion does not automatically involve the use of force in every case. Probably this principle also underlies Ps. 68:28(27), which calls Benjamin, though the youngest, "their ruler," alluding to the early dominance of the tribe of Benjamin over other Israelite tribes, a situation possibly reflected also in Jgs. 5:14 as well as in the time of Saul.[18] Similarly, the law governing treatment of persons enslaved for debt forbids ruling over them "with harshness" *(b*ᵉ*p̄erek̲)* (Lev. 25:43,46,53).

---

16. Wildberger, 124; Wolff, 163; Schmidt, 139-41.

17. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1989), 75, 349-50.

18. See, respectively, H.-J. Zobel, *Stammesspruch und Geschichte. BZAW* 95 (1965), 46; Kraus, 45.

This brings us to a final example. Joel 4:13(3:13) is a summons to harvest the grain and then make wine: because the winepress is full, the men are to come and "tread." Here *rdh* clearly refers to the treading of the winepress.[19] Derivation of this form *r^eḏû* from the root *yrd,* "go down,"[20] is grammatically possible but unlikely in this context. If, then, *rdh* means "tread," and if in association with a king it means "rule, have dominion," we must inquire concerning the relationship between the two meanings. Since Lohfink proposes a different root for Joel 4:13(3:13), he takes "wander about" as the basic meaning of *rdh,* with the semantic development "accompany" > "lead" > "rule."[21] For Lohfink, then, the aspect of dominion is secondary. The same is true in the case of those who take "tread" as the basic meaning,[22] arguing that the meaning "rule" is based on the image of treading under one's feet. In this analysis the "treading" is often rendered more forcefully as "trampling over" or even "trampling underfoot."[23] As a result, ruling becomes associated inherently with coercion and tyranny. Some scholars do, however, point out that the treading of grapes in the wine press is a positive action with respect to the end products, must and wine, or that the treading of grapes is a "re-fashioning activity,"[24] so that ruling must be understood as a beneficial action. The question can hardly be resolved in principle, because Joel 4:13(3:13) admits both aspects, and the OT also expresses ambivalence about the exercise of rule.

3. *Religious Usage.* In the strict sense there is no religious usage involving *rdh,* because God does not appear as either subject or object. Of course, the legislation concerning debt slaves can be called religious on the grounds that they presuppose a theologically based anthropology. In Israel rule over such slaves must never be exercised "with harshness" (*b^eperek̠,* Lev. 25:43,46,53). If an Israelite is the owner of an Israelite debt slave, the motivation for humane treatment is the servitude of Israel in Egypt and personal fear of God (25:42-43). But if the owner of the Israelite slave is a resident alien who has prospered, then 25:53 requires the Israelites themselves "to be responsible for seeing that the alien does not mistreat their brother."[25]

A comparable anthropological conviction also lies behind Gen. 1:26,28. Here, in the context of P's creation account, the relationship of human beings to (the earth and) other living creatures is defined.

Once again using *rdh* and *b^e,* Gen. 1:26 names the object of human dominion as "the fish of the sea, the birds of the air, all 'the wild animals of' the earth, and every creep-

---

19. *AuS,* IV, 354-82, esp. 369.
20. Lohfink, "Erde," 139; *idem,* "Growth," 178.
21. "Growth," 167-68; cf. *idem,* "Erde," 139.
22. Von Rad, 160; Wolff, 163; O. Kaiser, *Das Buch des Propheten Jesaja. ATD* XVIII (1983), 24 n. 12.
23. For the former see Schmidt, 147 n. 3; Wildberger, 124; W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 205; K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* IV (1966), 358 n. 54, 361; C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1984), 158-60. For the latter see Lohfink, "Growth," 178.
24. Wolff, 163.
25. Elliger, *HAT* IV, 359.

ing thing." V. 28 lists these as "the fish of the sea, the birds of the air, and every living thing that moves upon the earth." V. 26 associates the dominion exercised by human beings with their being made in the image of God.[26] And v. 28 defines God's blessing upon humankind by speaking first of fertility, increase, and filling the earth and subduing it, then in a second section of human dominion over the animal kingdom. This blessing thus includes more than does God's decision to create humankind (v. 26), where the first section does not occur. Could this mean that dominion is understood as belonging inherently to humankind, distinguished from the blessing of increase because the latter is associated with the whole animal kingdom (v. 22)? This interpretation is certainly possible, but v. 28 speaks of "subduing the earth" *(wᵉḵiḇšuhā)* as an element of God's blessing alongside dominion over the animal kingdom. And Westermann is correct in considering the root *kbš* substantially synonymous with *rdh;*[27] of course it does not mean subjection by force, but rather putting the earth to use.[28] It is thus clear that being made in God's image includes exercising dominion over the earth and its fauna and that this dominion is understood as a blessing.[29]

If we take this double conclusion as our starting point for further analysis of human dominion, we first note that the association of our word with royal ideology means only that to human beings alone among living creatures has God granted royal status.[30] In this sense Ps. 8:7(6) "is saying exactly the same,"[31] since v. 6(5) describes human beings as crowned kings. But we must be careful not to read too much into the similarity of this language to that of the royal court, looking for an association with the violent regimes of the ancient Near East or even saying that the "dignity of absolute royal rule is granted to the multitude of all men."[32] Gen. 1 says nothing at all about the characteristic feature of such kings, namely their dominion over nations and hence other human beings.[33] In a discussion of Gen. 1, therefore, it would be hard to speak of dominion "over the world,"[34] not to mention dominion over creation.[35]

Human dominion, limited to the earth and the animal kingdom, derives from being made in the image of God and is understood as an aspect of God's blessing. It follows necessarily that human dominion is a power bestowed by God and must serve to maintain God's order.[36] Human rule must have positive consequences for the ruled; in ruling, humans must preserve their humanity and remain humane.[37] Therefore human dominion can be understood only as an action for which humans are accountable to God.

---

26. Zimmerli, 28ff.; Schmidt, 139-42.
27. Westermann, 161.
28. Contra S. Wagner, → VII, 56. See K. Koch, *VT* 37 (1987) 459.
29. For a detailed discussion see Schmidt, 147ff.
30. Westermann, 158.
31. *Idem.*
32. Wolff, 163.
33. W. Gross, → IX, 69.
34. Von Rad, 160.
35. Childs, 199.
36. W. Gross, → IX, 71.
37. Westermann, 159-60.

Even the slaying of animals is not permitted until the time of "Noachite man."[38] Human dominion over the earth should therefore contribute to the preservation and benefit of God's creation.[39]

We may ask the meaning of the fact that such dominion is mentioned only in Gen. 1:28, and does not even reappear when the command to be fruitful and multiply is repeated in 9:7. Indeed, many scholars propose emending 9:7 to include dominion, on the grounds that the restriction of the prohibition against slaying in 9:1-3 is needed to make "human dominion humane."[40] Others follow the MT as it stands, concluding from the deliberate omission of human dominion that it had "become irrelevant to post-deluge humanity," because humans and animals were now enemies, so that something like a "state of war" existed between humanity and the animal kingdom.[41] Although it is proper to use the MT as our point of departure, it would be wrong to allow subsequent texts to relativize what is said in Gen. 1. Nothing is retracted: humanity remains made in the image of God; the blessing on humanity is not revoked, so that human beings still exercise divine dominion within the created order.[42]

Finally, in describing more closely the nature of human dominion, we must keep in mind that Gen. 1 voices the anthropological convictions of P and that H, with its requirement that masters treat enslaved debtors humanely, stands fairly close to P in time.[43]

4. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* The usage of *rdh* in the Dead Sea Scrolls closely resembles that of the OT. Dominion is thought of in royal terms: the daughters of the people are to rule *bᵉmalkûṯ* (1QM 12:15; 19:7). Nu. 24:17b is quoted in 1QM 11:6, and v. 19 follows in l. 7: *wyrd myʿqwb whʾbyd śryd* [*m*]*ʿr,* which Lohse translates: "He will come forth from Jacob and destroy those who have escaped [from the] city."[44] Maier translates: "He comes down from Jacob . . . ," while noting that Bardtke, Carmignac, and Dupont-Sommer prefer "rule," deriving the verbal form from *rdh* rather than *yrd,* probably a more likely interpretation.[45] Finally, 1QS 9:23 uses our verb with *bᵉ* for domineering a slave.

Two passages in unpublished scrolls speak of a sinner's sins (*ʿwnwt*) against "his master" (*rwdh,* qal ptcp.), suggesting the possible use of the participle as a divine appellative.

The root *rdd* occurs only in the expression *qôl mᵉrûddāḏ,* "a sustained sound" (1QM 8:5,14).

Zobel

---

38. G. Botterweck, → III, 137.
39. H.-J. Zobel, *ZZ* 38 (1984) 228-33, with bibliog.
40. See, e.g., Westermann, 462-63; see also 469.
41. E.g., Lohfink, "Growth," 180. A similar position is taken by Wolff, 248 n. 13; more recently K. Koch, *VT* 37 (1987) 458-59.
42. Schmidt, 143-44.
43. O. Eissfeldt, *Einleitung* (⁴1976), 317; cf. Elliger, *HAT* IV, 347-48.
44. E. Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran* (Munich, ²1971), 205.
45. J. Maier, *Die Texte vom Toten Meer* (Munich, 1960), I, 137; II, 127.

רדם rdm; תַּרְדֵּמָה tardēmâ

I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences. II. Everyday Meaning. III. Theological Usage: 1. God as Agent; 2. Holy War; 3. Revelation; 4. Covenant. IV. LXX and Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. 1. *Etymology.* Whether the root *rdm* has cognates in other Semitic languages is uncertain. It is hard to prove derivation from an original biliteral root *dam* or *tam,* "stop up, close," with different triliteral equivalents in the various Semitic languages.[1] There may be some connection with Akk. *nardamu,* "bridle, noose; mooring pole,"[2] or "footprint; clasp";[3] or *radāmu,* "fetus; pour forth?"[4] The Arabic cognates are *radama,* "stop up, fill up, repair," and *radm,* "filling up, dam."[5] This is sometimes taken as the basic meaning of the Hebrew word.[6]

2. *Occurrences.* The verb *rdm* occurs 7 times in the OT, always in the niphal: Jon. 1:5,6; Prov. 10:5; Ps. 76:7(Eng. 6); Dnl. 8:18; 10:9; cf. Jgs. 4:21. The derived noun *tardēmâ* also occurs 7 times: Gen. 2:21; 15:12; 1 S. 26:12; Isa. 29:10; Job 4:13; 33:15; Prov. 19:15.

II. Everyday Meaning. The different phases of sleep identified by modern study are reflected already in the Hebrew vocabulary — if we take this statement with a grain of salt and allow a certain vagueness in the distinctions. The first phase, light and superficial slumber, is referred to as *nûmâ* (from *nwm*). Normal sleep, with its phases of rapid eye movement indicating dreams, is called *šēnā'/h.* Deep, dreamless sleep is termed *tardēmâ.*

Sleep in general[7] means in the first instance the cessation of bodily activity and dis-

---

rdm. W. Beyerlin, *Die Rettung der Bedrängten in den Feindpsalmen der Einzelnen auf institutionelle Zusammenhänge untersucht. FRLANT* 99 (1970); A. de Buck, *De godsdienstige opfatting van den slaap inzonderheit in het oude Egypte. MEOL* 4 (1939); M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography, XII," *Bibl* 55 (1974) 381-93, esp. 391-92; L. Delekat, *Asylie und Schutzorakel am Zionsheiligtum* (Leiden, 1967); E. L. Ehrlich, *Der Traum im AT. BZAW* 73 (1953); S. Fraenkel, "Miscellen zum Koran, 1. Die Seele während des Schlafes," *ZDMG* 56 (1902) 71-72; R. K. Gnuse, *The Dream Theophany of Samuel* (Lanham, 1984); R. Schlichting, "Schlaf," *LexÄg,* V, 642-44; H. Schmidt, *Das Gebet der Angeklagten im AT. BZAW* 49 (1928); J. G. S. S. Thomson, "Sleep, an Aspect of Jewish Anthropology," *VT* 5 (1955) 421-33; W. Westendorf, "Beiträge aus und zu den medizinischen Texten, III. Incubus-Vorstellungen," *ZÄS* 96 (1970) 145-49.

1. Thomson, 422-23.
2. *CAD,* N/1, 351-52.
3. *AHw,* II, 746.
4. *AHw,* II, 941.
5. Wehr, 335.
6. *GesB,* 746.
7. → ישן *yāšēn.*

cursive thought; this temporary inactivity is salubrious and alleviates fatigue. Sleep is a necessary counterpart to physical labor and muscular exertion. Insomnia is considered a punishment for a deviant way of life (e.g., Prov. 4:16; Eccl. 5:11b[12b]). Sound sleep is "sweet," i.e., it is a benefit vouchsafed to the wise (Prov. 3:24) and those who labor honestly (Eccl. 5:11a[12a]). Nevertheless, this great gift of God must be enjoyed in proper measure and at the proper time. Oversleeping at inappropriate times is sharply criticized by the sages. Prov. 10:5 castigates sleeping in harvest time as a disgrace, in contrast to the proper productive behavior. According to Prov. 19:15, laziness brings on deep sleep; such idleness results in hunger. (The text, though well attested, could be corrupt; emendation of *tardēmâ* to the graphically similar *ḥ^adārîm* would produce a strict parallelism: "laziness causes the storerooms to diminish.")[8]

That deep sleep blocks all perception, even of extreme danger, is illustrated by Jgs. 4:21, where Jael kills the sleeping Sisera with a tent peg, and by 1 S. 26:12, where David protects the sleeping Saul, refusing out of respect for Yahweh's anointed to seize the chance to kill his persecutor.

III. Theological Usage.

1. *God as Agent.* That sleep gives rise to bridges enabling human beings to encounter God and permitting knowledge from the divine sphere to penetrate the human sphere is a notion encountered frequently in the ancient Near East. The OT, too, ascribes unusually deep sleep to God, most clearly in 1 S. 26:12: *tardēmaṯ yhwh* (Dahood interprets the phrase as a superlative[9]). By means of sleep, God effectively eliminates the human beings around Saul and prevents them from interfering with the divine plan. There may also be overtones of this notion in Jon. 1:5-6. If so, Jonah's deep sleep amid the panic of the gentile crew would show that he is still profoundly connected with the true God even when fleeing from the presence of Yahweh. His calm during the storm is grounded in his confession of faith (1:9) and is an implicit polemic against the foreign gods. (Wolff reads this scene, like the entire book, quite differently: as a satirical criticism of Jonah, who in stark contrast to the exemplary conduct of the gentile sailors withdraws into a deep, deathlike sleep, fails to ask Yahweh's will, perseveres in his flight, and makes nothing more than an "emotionless, superficial confession of faith.")[10]

The earliest text is probably Gen. 2:21 (J), which tells how the rib from which Eve was formed was taken from Adam "in a deep sleep." One popular interpretation of this element of the creation story suggests that the creature cannot look upon the Creator in the act of creation, that creation must always remain a mystery.[11] More recently the motif of Adam's deep sleep has been interpreted as reflecting the relationship between man and woman and emphasizing the equality of the sexes: just as when he himself

8. See *BHS*.

9. Dahood, 391.

10. H. W. Wolff, *Jona. BK* XIV/3 (1977), 99.

11. H. Gunkel, *Genesis. HKAT* I/1 (⁹1977), 12; G. von Rad, *Genesis. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1961), 81-82; W. Zimmerli, *1. Mose 1-11. ZBK, in loc.*

was created, the man is totally passive during the creation of the woman. In other words, God created both equally.[12]

2. *Holy War.* In contrast to the usual descriptions of panic, Ps. 76:6-7(5-6) — uniquely in the context of a holy war — says that at the shattering appearance of Yahweh the enemy fell into a coma and "lay stunned." They were helpless as though paralyzed.

3. *Revelation.* It is often suggested that sleep promoted insight into divine reality (e.g., Nu. 22:8; 1 S. 3:1ff.).[13] In particular, it is argued, the legal institution of incubation in the temple served in Israel as a means of determining God's judgment, as reflected, e.g., in Ps. 3:6(5); 4:9(8); 5:4(3); 17:3-5.[14] "Probably the conception is that the human being in his sleep no longer has the potential of hiding his thoughts. The innermost recesses are laid bare." There is nothing to hinder God's "investigation" of the heart.[15] But the root *rdm* never appears in this context. In late texts like Dnl. 8:18 and 10:9 (in context), it is true, deep sleep is probably an element in the process of revelation. Scholars often simply assume that Daniel collapsed in terror when the angel spoke to him.[16] But something more is probably involved. "The visions . . . show that their author knew what ecstasy is."[17] When a prophet functions as a "medium," the personal human component in the process of revelation is reduced steadily until the recipient is left powerless. The description of the process resembles that of mystical "emptying."

This phenomenon stands in sharp contrast to Isa. 29:10, where the phrase *rûaḥ tardēmâ* denotes the very opposite, the cessation of all revelation, a profound hardness of heart sent as God's judgment to punish the disobedient people (cf. also Jer. 23:23ff.).

4. *Covenant.* Theologically, the most important text is probably Gen. 15:12. It is hard to assign this passage to a source stratum.[18] The deep sleep that falls upon Abraham is not intended to set the scene as the reception of a prophetic oracle. Its point is rather to emphasize that Yahweh's covenant with Abraham is to be ascribed entirely and exclusively to Yahweh's own initiative. Abraham, the human party to the covenant, is sound asleep at the moment of God's critical action. The ritual passage of both par-

---

12. C. Uehlinger, *BN* 43 (1988) 90-99; C. Dohmen, *Schöpfung und Tod. SBB* 17 (1988), 84, 306-8; H. Schüngel-Straumann, "Frau und Mann in den biblischen Schöpfungstexten," in P. Gordan, ed., *Gott schuf den Menschen als Mann und Frau* (Graz, 1989), 73-103, esp. 84-85.

13. A. Jirku, *ZAW* 33 (1913) 151-53.

14. See esp. Schmidt; Delekat, 6-7, 70-72; Beyerlin.

15. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1988), 247.

16. See, e.g., K. Marti, *KHC* XVIII, 61, 75.

17. A. Bentzen, *Daniel. HAT* XIX (1952), 6; cf. G. Hölscher, *Die Profeten* (Leipzig, 1914), 15, 26ff.

18. For a survey of the many literary analyses, see J. Ha, *Genesis 15. BZAW* 181 (1989), on two folded leaves between pp. 30 and 31. Ha considers the whole chapter homogeneous and late; for a different view see H. Mölle, *Genesis 15. FzB* 62 (1989); P. Weimar, *FS J. Scharbert* (Stuttgart, 1989), 361-411.

ties through the cut-up animals (cf. Jer. 34:18) signifies a conditional self-execration should the agreement be broken,[19] a notion that pushes the boundaries of theological expression: God will dismember himself just like the animals should he break the covenant. The mutuality of the covenant ritual, conventional elsewhere, here unfolds in the direction of a unilateral commitment on the part of God.[20]

IV. LXX and Dead Sea Scrolls. To translate the 14 occurrences of the verb and noun, the LXX uses no fewer than 9 different lexemes: it translates the verb with *existánai,* "lose consciousness, be transported" (Jgs. 4:21); *nystázein,* "slumber" (Ps. 76:7[6]); *katanenygménos,* "fast asleep" (Dnl. 10:9 Theodotion; LXX reads *peptōkṓs*); and *katheúdein,* "sleep," par. *rhénkein,* "snore" (Jon. 1:5,6); the noun with *ékstasis,* "ecstasy" (Gen. 2:21; 15:12); *phóbos,* "fear" (Job 4:13; 33:15); *thámbos,* "astonishment" (1 S. 26:12); and *katányxis,* "stupor" (Isa. 29:10). Clearly anomalous is the translation *androgýnaion,* "androgyny," in Prov. 19:15. The meaning of the Hebrew text was patently unclear to the translators.

The root has not been found in the Dead Sea Scrolls published to date.

Oeming

19. On the practice of mutilation as a punishment for breaking a treaty, see G. Brunet, *SVT* 30 (1979), 65-72.

20. See the numerous works of E. Kutsch on the subject of *bᵉrîṯ,* e.g., *NT — Neuer Bund?* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1978), esp. 22-23.

רָדַף *rāḏap*

I. Etymology. II. 1. OT; 2. Military Contexts; 3. Figurative Usage; 4. Adversaries in Poetry. III. LXX. IV. Dead Sea Scrolls.

rāḏap. M. L. Barré, "Amos 1:11 Reconsidered," *CBQ* 47 (1985) 420-27; W. Beyerlin, *Die Rettung der Bedrängten in den Feindpsalmen der Einzelnen auf institutionelle Zusammenhänge untersucht. FRLANT* 99 (1970); A. Deissler, *Psalm 119 (118) und seine Theologie. MTS* 11 (1955); M. Dijkstra and J. C. de Moor, "Problematical Passages in the Legend of Aqhâtu," *UF* 7 (1975) 171-215; J. P. Floss, *Kunden oder Kundschafter. ATS* 16, 26 (1982-86); E. S. Gerstenberger, *Der bittende Mensch. WMANT* 54 (1981); N. Ittmann, *Die Konfessionen Jeremias. WMANT* 54 (1981); O. Keel, *Feinde und Gottesleugner. SBM* 7 (1969); W. Richter, *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Richterbuch. BBB* 19 (1963); B. Rocco, "Le iscrizioni fenice della Grotta Regina e la Bibbia," *RivB* 17 (1969) 421-26; L. Ruppert, *Der*

I. Etymology. Apart from Hebrew, the root *rdp* is not clearly attested in Northwest Semitic.[1] It does occur in East Semitic, albeit as an Aramaic loanword, as in the somewhat rare *radāpu,*[2] synonymous with the commoner Akk. *radādu,* which means both "pursue" and (preceding another verb) "do as soon as possible";[3] *radpi/u,* "urgent";[4] and *ridpu,* "pursuit."[5] Von Soden traces both semantic spectra of this root in Akkadian to Aramaic, i.e., West Semitic.[6] The problem remains that *rdp* is not attested in the Old Aramaic and Imperial Aramaic dialects, although later occurrences probably allow it to be reclaimed for Old Aramaic. It appears first in Nabatean (as a PN in one epigraphic text),[7] in a West Aramaic funerary inscription (Jerusalem, around the time of Jesus' birth),[8] in Samaritan,[9] and in Jewish Aramaic.[10] In addition, *rdp* appears in Christian Palestinian Aramaic,[11] Syriac,[12] Mandaic,[13] and Judeo-Babylonian.[14]

In South Semitic the root is attested in Arabic,[15] New South Arabic,[16] and possibly Old South Arabic,[17] with the basic meaning "follow after, pursue," as well as some secondary meanings. South Semitic exhibits a striking semantic restriction to contexts of (camel) riding: "ride after, ride/mount one behind the other."

In West Semitic (apart from Aramaic; see above), the root is represented in South Canaanite only in Biblical Hebrew. Epigraphic evidence from the other dialects is almost entirely lacking. The root is probably not attested in Ugaritic. (Only in *KTU* 1.17, II, 41 has the disputed reading *rdpt nʿmy ʿrn h*[*r*]*m* been proposed.[18] Since this would

---

leidende Gerechte. FzB 5 (1972); *idem, Der leidende Gerechte und seine Feinde* (Würzburg, 1973); L. Schwienhorst, *Die Eroberung Jerichos. SBS* 122 (1986); W. von Soden, "Aramäische Wörter in neuassyrischen und neu- und spätbabylonischen Texten," *Or* 37 (1968) 261-71; P. Weimar, *Die Meerwundererzählung. ÄAT* 9 (1985); *idem* and E. Zenger, *Exodus. SBS* 75 (1975); E. Zenger, "Tradition und Interpretation in Ex XV 1-21," *SVT* 32 (1981) 452-83.

1. I. J. Gelb, *Computer-Aided Analysis of Amorite. AS* 21 (1980), 345.
2. *AHw,* II, 941.
3. *AHw,* II, 940.
4. *AHw,* II, 941.
5. *AHw,* II, 981.
6. P. 265.
7. *RES* 805; cf. *ESE,* II, 258.
8. Beyer, 346-47, with bibliog.
9. F. Rosenthal, *An Aramaic Handbook. PLO* 10, 2 parts in 4 vols. (1967), II/2, 10; R. Macuch, *Grammatik des Samaritanischen Aramäisch* (Berlin, 1982), 407.
10. For the Dead Sea Scrolls see IV below.
11. F. Schulthess, *Lexicon Syropalestinum* (Berlin, 1903), 190.
12. R. Payne Smith, *Thesaurus Syriacus,* 2 vols. (Oxford, 1868-97), II, 3824-25; *LexSyr,* 715.
13. *MdD,* 425.
14. *WTM,* IV, 429-30; Beyer, 692.
15. Wehr, 335.
16. T. M. Johnstone, *Mehri Lexicon and English-Mehri Word-List* (London, 1987), 315; *idem, Jibbāli Lexicon* (Oxford, 1981).
17. ContiRossini, 238; Biella, 381; 1 PN in a Sabaean (?) inscription (*RES,* 5044; cf. Ryckmans, 197: *radīf*).
18. Dijkstra and de Moor, 180.

be the only occurrence of the root in Ugaritic, there is little to support it.[19]) For Phoenician and Punic, there is no evidence from the mainland; there are several occurrences (5th-4th century) of the root from the Sicilian grotto of Regina.[20]

As the spotty geographical distribution of the earlier occurrences of the root would lead one to expect, the etymology of the Hebrew verb *rāḏap* remains obscure. Gesenius proposed a connection with verbs containing the radicals *dp* (with the basic meaning "push"), including *hāḏap, nāḏap,* and *dāpâ,* with one occurrence of *dōpî* in Ps. 50:20;[21] this proposal was accepted by Levy and expanded to include derivatives of the radical *ndp.*[22] This theory probably rests on the semantic similarity of the verbs *nāḏap* (Prov. 21:6; Job 13:5; Isa. 41:2; and the rhyme in Lev. 26:36) and *hāḏap* (see esp. its use in Dt. 6:19; 9:4; Josh. 23:5) to the basic meaning of *rāḏap,* "pursue, follow after"; but this similarity can hardly be cited as evidence for the historical etymology of the verb, for which one must still rely on South Semitic (see above). A parallel development to that of *rdp* in East Semitic *radādu* may also be considered.

II. 1. *OT.* The verb occurs a total of 143 times in the OT; in addition, there is a nominalized hophal ptcp. *murdāp* in Isa. 14:6.[23] The verb appears primarily in the qal (131 times). The distribution displays a concentration in the books of Joshua–2 Samuel (20 occurrences in Joshua, 10 in Judges, 11 each in 1 and 2 Samuel), where, as befits their theme, accounts of military pursuit are concentrated; there is another concentration in Psalms (20 times), which often describe the situation of an individual psalmist metaphorically as "being pursued." The remaining occurrences are widely scattered (5 each in Genesis and Exodus, 7 in Leviticus [only in ch. 26], 8 in Deuteronomy, 1 in 1 Kings, 3 in 2 Kings, 5 in Isaiah, 6 in Jeremiah, 2 in Ezekiel, 3 in Hosea, 1 in Amos, 4 in Job, 2 in Proverbs, 5 in Lamentations, 1 in Nehemiah, and 2 in 2 Chronicles). There also two occurrences of the niphal ("be driven, pursued," Lam. 5:5; Eccl. 3:15),[24] one of the pual (Isa. 17:13, used synonymously with *ndp;* cf. Ps. 1:4; Isa. 41:2; Job 13:25),[25] and one of the hithpael (*hirᵉdîpuhû,* Jgs. 20:43, without any discernible difference in meaning from the qal).[26] There are altogether 8 occurrences of the piel (Hos. 2:9[Eng. 7]; Nah. 1:8; Prov. 11:19; 12:11; 13:21; 15:9; 19:7; 28:19); these denote more of an idealized "pursuit" (see below).

The meaning "go after, follow," in the sense of accompaniment, suggested for the qal of *rdp* in Jgs. 3:28, is unlikely,[27] and can also be postulated with the aid of the

---

19. Cf. now the reading by B. Margalit, *The Ugaritic Poem of AQHT. BZAW* 182 (1989), 176, 430.

20. Rocco, 422-23.

21. *GesTh,* 1266-67.

22. *WTM,* IV, 429.

23. *HAL,* II, 632.

24. See II.3 below.

25. *GesB,* 488.

26. On the vocalization see also *GK,* §20h n. 1, §22s.

27. As already pointed out by O. Eissfeldt, *Die Quellen des Richterbuches* (Leipzig, 1925), 19-20.

Arabic adj. *radîf,* "(riding) behind."[28] The polarity of two parties as well as the associated hostile connotations are essential to the basic meaning. In Jgs. 3:28 it is probably best to read *reḏû,* following LXX.[29]

2. *Military Contexts.* Most occurrences of *rdp* involve military terminology. It appears in several narratives of the wars of Yahweh, although it is not a formulaic expression of the "theory" of the so-called holy war.[30] In military contexts the verb denotes the active pursuit of one or more persons, with hostile intent (e.g., Gen. 14:14-15; Dt. 1:44; Josh. 2; 8; Jgs. 4:22; 7:25; 1 S. 23:25; 25:29; 26:18; 2 S. 17:1; 20:6-7; 24:13; Isa. 41:3; Ezk. 35:6; Hos. 8:3; Ps. 109:16). The expression *rāḏap 'aḥarê* (+ pronominal suf.) occurs about 45 times (e.g., Gen. 35:5; Josh. 2:7; Jgs. 8:5; 1 S. 23:25; 2 S. 17:1; 2 K. 5:21; only once do we find *wayyirdepû 'el-miḏyān* [Jgs. 7:25]: adversative or locative[31]); the use of *'aḥarê* also serves to express the spatial separation between pursuer and pursued.[32] Aside from a slightly diminished frequency of this expression in poetic and prophetic texts, there is no discernible semantic difference, not even in intensity, marked by the presence or absence of *'aḥarê* (cf., e.g., Jgs. 4:16 with 9:40; 2 Ch. 13:19 with 14:12[13]; 2 S. 2:19 with Am. 1:11).

The verbal clause "X pursues Y" is sometimes expanded to include more details concerning the geographical extent of the pursuit (e.g., Gen. 14:14: *wayyirdōp 'aḏ-dān;* Josh. 2:7: *rāḏepû 'aḥarê;* 1 S. 23:25: *wayyirdōp 'aḥaarê-ḏāwiḏ* [*be*]*miḏbar mā'ôn;* similarly Gen. 14:15; Dt. 1:44; Josh. 7:5; 10:10; 11:8; 24:6; Jgs. 4:16; 20:43; 1 S. 7:11; 17:52; 2 Ch. 14:12). In many cases the additional information serves not so much to define the limit of the pursuit as to emphasize the completeness of the victory.[33]

In two texts the pursuit is expanded by a temporal expression. The first, Gen. 31:23 (J), describes Laban's pursuit of Jacob: *dereḵ šiḇ'aṯ yāmîm.* It is unclear whether this apposition formed part of the original narrative. V. 25 begins with *wayyaśśēḡ lāḇān 'eṯ-ya'aqōḇ,* repeating the *wayyaśśēḡ* of v. 23. Some scholars consider v. 25aα the continuation of v. 23b.[34] But if the story of Jacob's flight in vv. 22-23,25 is formulated deliberately to echo Ex. 14:9 (which does not say how long the pursuit lasted),[35] would it not be more reasonable to delete v. 23aβ-b as a secondary introduction to v. 24? If so, the interpolator added v. 23, describing the length of the pursuit and locating Laban's dream in the hill country of Gilead, in order give firm shape to the narrative. The obser-

---

28. See above; J. Gray, *Joshua, Judges, Ruth. NCBC* (1986), 252.

29. *GesB,* 746; *HAL,* III, 1192; on the consequences of this emendation for literary analysis, see Richter, 7.

30. F. Stolz, *Jahwes und Israels Kriege. ATANT* 60 (1972); Richter, 177-86; → מלחמה *milḥāmâ.*

31. *GesB,* 37-38.

32. → אחרי *'aḥarê.*

33. Richter, 53.

34. C. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1985), 494; E. Blum, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte. WMANT* 57 (1984), 125, 131; *et al.*

35. Weimar and Zenger, 51-52; see also W. Fuss, *Die deuteronomistisch Pentateuchredaktion in Exodus 3–17. BZAW* 126 (1972), 304.

vation that *dbq* in v. 23b, unlike *nśg,* exhibits affinities with *rdp* (see below) and has no parallel in Ex. 14:9 also supports this analysis.

The second temporal expression, in 2 S. 17:1, is unproblematic; it describes not the duration of the pursuit but the time it takes place: Ahithophel proposes to pursue David at night.

Accounts of the military pursuit of one or several enemies rarely appear out of nowhere. Panicked flight after battle against a superior foe evokes pursuit (Josh. 10:10; 11:8; 1 S. 17:52; also the story in Josh. 8 [feigned flight]; and other texts). This situation is often marked textually by the use of → נוס *nûs* (Gen. 31:22-23 — for good reason — uses the synonym → ברח *brḥ*[36] for flight motivated by social pressure, as does the J narrative thread of Ex. 14:5*,9; see below). The verbs *nûs* and *rdp* thus form part of a Dtr "pattern" used to describe battles (Josh. 7:4-5; Jgs. 1:6; 4:15-16; 7:23; 8:12; 1 S. 17:51-52; 1 K. 20:20; 2 K. 9:27; 2 Ch. 14:11-12). Here *rdp* is a technical term for the continuation of a battle following victory (clearly, e.g., in Gen. 14:15: *wayyakkēm wayyirdᵉpēm ʿaḏ-ḥôḇâ;* and in Josh. 10:19: *riḏpû ʾaḥᵃrê ʾōyᵉḇêḵem wᵉzinnaḇtem ʾōṯām*).

The goal of this pursuit by the victors is to overtake the fugitives, then totally to destroy, liquidate, or drive out the enemy. These two elements also belong to the pattern mentioned above, but do not necessarily appear together. Overtaking (→ נשׂג *nśg* hiphil) appears in Gen. 31:25; 44:4; Ex. 14:9; 15:9; Josh. 2:5; 1 S. 30:8; 2 K. 25:5 par. Jer. 39:5; Jer. 52:8; Ps. 18:38(37) (unlike 2 S. 22:38); Lam. 1:3. The battle after the fugitives are overtaken is often described with → נכה *nkh* hiphil (e.g., Josh. 7:5; 10:10; 11:8; 1 S. 7:11; 2 S. 2:22-23; 2 K. 9:27) or → נפל *npl* (e.g., Jgs. 4:16; 9:40; 1 S. 17:52; 2 Ch. 14:12[13]). Depending on the purpose of the pursuit, other verbs are also found (e.g., *tpś,* 2 K. 25:5-6; Jer. 52:9; *lqḥ,* Jer. 39:5; *ʾḥz,* Jgs. 1:6; *lkd,* Jgs. 8:12; *znb,* Josh. 10:19).

The logical sequence of events as listed (battle, flight, pursuit, overtaking, battle) does not always appear in the text. The elements do not constitute a set formula repeated using the same words. Most often we find the pair *nûs* and *rdp* or *rdp* and *nśg;* the latter can also function as a merism including the other elements (1 S. 30:8; Ex. 15:9; Lam. 1:3).

In rhetorical settings Weimar and Zenger prefer to shift the emphasis to the act of overtaking, postulating for the narrative texts a concentration — not demonstrable statistically — on the pursuit of Israelites by non-Israelites.[37] Barré also postulates a fixed pattern, which, however, does not include *nûs* as an element in the logical sequence of battle; his action of pursuit comprises three stages: "catch up with — apprehend — decide fate of." Even a glance at his table, in which only three passages reflect the entire triad, suggests combining the last two elements.[38]

The reworked narrative in Josh. 7:2-5 and 8:1-35 provides a good example of the literary realization of this battle pattern. While 7:4-5 follows this schema, with its ele-

36. On the difference in meaning between the two synonyms, see E. Jenni, *Or* 47 (1978) 351-59.

37. Weimar and Zenger, 52-53.

38. See Barré, 423-24.

ments of battle, flight, pursuit, and renewed battle, ch. 8, with the device of feigning flight to provoke pursuit (v. 6: *wᵉyāṣᵉ'û 'aḥᵃrênû;* vv. 16,17,20,24: *rdp*), turns these very elements into the motif that dominates the whole narrative of the capture of Ai.

The schema of pursuing a fleeing enemy appears also to have influenced the law governing cities of refuge in Dt. 19:5-6 (*nûs, rāḏap, nāśag, nāḵâ;* in Josh. 20:4-5 without *nāśag,* for contextual reasons[39]) and the Dtr curse in Dt. 28:45 *(ûrᵉḏāpûḵā wᵉhiśśîḡûḵā 'aḏ hiššāmᵉḏāḵ);* see also the interpolation Dt. 30:7, where curses pursue Israel's enemies and adversaries (28:15 and 29:19[20] say substantially the same).[40]

Since *rāḏap* often results in the final defeat or annihilation of the enemy, an implication that is present even when the verb is used by itself (Josh. 23:10; 1 S. 30:8; 2 S. 20:6; Isa. 41:3; Hos. 8:3; etc.), the image of pursuit is well suited to express extreme tribulation, affliction, or overwhelming power. This usage probably accounts for its frequent occurrence (7 times) in the blessing and curse section of H (Lev. 26). V. 7 promises "deadly superiority" in pursuit; in v. 8 a later hand has magnified the promise in a numerical chiasm: "Pursue will five of you a hundred, and a hundred of you ten thousand will pursue."[41] (Similar quantitative exaggeration appears also in Josh. 23:10: *'îš-'eḥāḏ mikkem yirdop-'ālep;* Dt. 32:30; Isa. 30:17.) The motif is reversed in v. 17 and vv. 36-37 (the latter from a later hand): "panicked flight" in ignominious defeat. The accursed fugitive, imagining peril, flees "at the sound of a driven leaf." Prov. 28:1 is similar: the wicked suffer the psychological pursuit of a "guilty conscience," fleeing though no one is in pursuit (cf. also Sir. 40:5ff.).[42]

The exodus narrative(s) in Ex. 14 use *rāḏap* to describe the action of Pharaoh and the Egyptians. The earliest narrative strands (J or pre-J) follow the description of the Israelites' flight (using *bāraḥ* rather than *nûs,* "escape from their ancestral lot"[43]) with *wayyirdᵉpû miṣrayim 'aḥᵃrêhem wayyaśśîḡû 'ōṯām* (v. 9), emphasizing the imminent danger *before* Yahweh's intervention. Vv. 4 and 8 (P) present Yahweh's statement of his intent and describe his action; they make Pharaoh the subject who pursues Israel *(rāḏap 'aḥᵃrê).*[44]

Ex. 14:23 is more difficult. Syntactically, there are two verbs with two different subjects: *wayyirdᵉpû miṣrayim wayyāḇō'û 'aḥᵃrêhem kōl sûs par'ōh.* V. 22 has already described Israel's passage *bᵉṯôḵ hayyām* (using *bô'*), so that the motion expressed by *rāḏap* is unambiguous. The second verb of motion in v. 23, *wayyāḇō'û 'aḥᵃrêhem,*

---

39. On the relationship between the two passages see D. Knapp, *Deuteronomium 4. GTA* 35 (1987), 117-20; also G. Braulik, *RB* 96 (1989) 281.

40. On the nature of these texts (Dt. 28:22 is discussed below), see A. D. H. Mayes, *Deuteronomy. NCBC* (1979), 364ff., 369; on parallels in ancient Near Eastern treaties, see esp. M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford, 1972), 109.

41. For literary analysis see K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* IV (1966), 366; R. Kilian, *Literarkritische und formgeschichtliche Untersuchung des Heiligkeitsgesetzes. BBB* 19 (1963), 149; on the cluster of motifs, see Mayes, *Deuteronomy,* 390.

42. O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos. BK* XVII (1984), 332. On the motif see Keel, 59-60.

43. S. Schwertner, *THAT,* II, 47.

44. For literary analysis and redaction history, see E. Zenger, *Exodus. Geistliche Schriftlesung* 7, 142-50; Weimar, *passim.*

seems redundant, especially with the ambiguous pronominal suffix, which appears to refer to the Egyptians, the subject of the preceding verb. Nevertheless, this expression corresponds to vv. 16 and 22, and esp. with vv. 17 and 28. There are two possible solutions: (1) Since *rāḏap* does not reappear in the description of the action in v. 22, it and its additional subject may be ascribed to later redaction (R^P; cf. also vv. 13b and 31). (2) The clauses are to be interpreted paratactically. In v. 23aα *rāḏap* emphasizes the intent of the pursuers to do battle, in contrast to moving toward the enemy. This purpose is further underlined by *bô'*, which echoes vv. 16 and 22.

The term *rāḏap* reappears frequently in the complex later development of the exodus narrative, e.g., in the "staccato" battle cry interpolated by R^P in Ex. 15:9: *'erdōp 'aśśîg* (the first of three stichs), which clearly ties the Song of the Sea to Ex. 14.[45] Furthermore, in the historical summaries in Dt. 11:4 and Josh. 24:6, the motif of Yahweh's role in the exodus is enriched by the explicit mention of the sea and the Egyptians' pursuit. Both texts must be very late, since they presuppose the exodus narrative of P.

The story of the spies in Josh. 2 uses *rāḏap* (vv. 5,7a) with its pl. ptcp. *hārōḏᵉpîm* (vv. 7b,16a-b,22a-b), denoting the "messengers" of the king, as a key word in the narrative. According to several scholars,[46] all these texts belong to the basic stratum; but v. 7a-b should be deleted, less because of the conflict between it and v. 6[47] than because of its somewhat incoherent relationship to v. 22 and the use of *hā'ᵃnāšîm* for the pursuers (instead of for the spies, as in vv. 2b,3,4a-b,5aα-β,9,14,17,23).[48] Without v. 7bβ *(yāṣᵉ'û hārōḏᵉpîm 'aḥᵃrêhem),* there is a logical leap between vv. 5 and 15 (in the basic stratum established by Floss[49]). The fundamental Dtn narrative strand (already reworked?)[50] comprises vv. 1-5,7bβ,15-16,22-23*. The messengers and agents of Jericho are called *hārōḏᵉpîm* throughout; the imperative in v. 5 is addressed to them. The "pursuit" motif characterizes "Jericho/Canaan" as the adversary of "Israel," denying Israel its lawful claim to the land. The use of the nominalized participle as a motif (Dtr!) may even have ethical connotations, likening the pursuers to the *rōḏᵉpay* of the Psalms.[51]

3. *Figurative Usage.* In a few passages the schema "X pursues Y" indigenous to military contexts is divided, with one or both parts being used partially or entirely figuratively. An impersonal (metaphorical or abstract) subject or object can replace the personal actors. When this happens, the aspect of motion toward the object receives less emphasis.

---

45. Zenger, 463, 475.

46. Including M. Noth, *Das Buch Josua. HAT* VII (³1971), 24-27; and T. C. Butler, *Joshua. WBC* VII (1983), 25-32.

47. Floss, *Kunden,* 1:74. Floss also considers v. 4a secondary in the light of v. 6; but the logic of the narrative requires an act of hiding to justify Rahab's answer in v. 4, and the location on the roof conflicts with v. 15.

48. *Ibid.,* 1:45; 2:115.

49. *Ibid.,* 1:210-11.

50. On the association with Dtr circles, see Schwienhorst, 105-11 (DtrN?); Stolz, *Kriege,* 80-81.

51. See II.4 below.

Dt. 28:22 (first redaction of ch. 28[52]), for example, uses *rāḏap* with an impersonal subject while retaining the personal object: diseases and natural disasters — like the curses themselves in v. 45 (see above) — will pursue those who refuse to obey the law until they perish *(ûrᵉḏāpûḵā ʿaḏ ʾoḇdeḵā).* In Ezk. 35:6 (also secondary according to Hossfeld[53]), Yahweh uses similarly figurative language: "Therefore, as I live, says Yahweh, I shall turn you into blood, and blood shall pursue you; if you do not hate blood, blood shall pursue you." The suggestion that this threatened action (!) alludes to Josh. 20:5 is dubious.[54] The graphic image of blood in hot pursuit is probably used as a symbol of judgment.[55] In Nah. 1:8, line *k* of an acrostic fragment, either the word *ḥōšeḵ* is directive ("He will make a full end of his adversaries, and will pursue his enemies into darkness"), in which case Yahweh is the pursuing subject,[56] or it is the subject of the second clause (". . . and darkness will pursue his enemies"). In both Ezk. 35:6 and Nah. 1:8, *rāḏap* denotes a durative action. In contrast to one-time military pursuit, these texts envision recurrent pursuit. Hos. 2:9(7) is similar ("She shall pursue her lovers, but not overtake them"), where the "passionate pursuit"[57] probably "takes the form of repeated advances."[58]

Job 30:15 is difficult, but the proposed deletion of v. 15a is hardly correct.[59] It is possible that *tirdōp* in v. 15a should be revocalized as a niphal *(tērāḏēp),* but the parallel in Isa. 17:13 also suggests vocalization as a pual ("pursued"): "Terrors are turned upon me, my honor is pursued as by the wind, and my help passes away like a cloud." The only other instance of the niphal, apart from the nominalized participle "what is pursued" in Eccl. 3:15, is a problematic occurrence in Lam. 5:5; therefore the passive counterpart to the piel, "pursue," would seem equally plausible in Job 30:15.[60] In the case of Isa. 17:13 (a secondary addition, possibly referring to the events of 701 B.C.E.),[61] the relationship to *ndp* has already been discussed above.

In Ps. 23:6 the situation of dire individual peril (see below) is given a positive twist: *ṭôḇ wāḥeseḏ yirdᵉpûnî.* Here pursuit no longer has the character of an isolated action with a defined goal, but is durative *(kol-yᵉmê ḥayyāy).* Similar is the contrast between the righteous and sinners in Prov. 13:21 (piel), where personified misfortune[62] pursues

52. Mayes, *Deuteronomy,* 348-49.

53. *Untersuchungen zu Komposition und Theologie des Ezechielbuches. FzB* 20 (1977), 114.

54. Contra H. Simian, *Die theologische Nachgeschichte der Prophetie Ezechiels. FzB* 14 (1974), 253.

55. On the nature of text and the difficult questions concerning its transmission, see also W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 224, 235.

56. K. Seybold, *Profane Profetie. SBS* 135 (1989), 77.

57. H. W. Wolff, *Hosea. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1974), 31, 36.

58. *HP,* 215.

59. Contra G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (^{2}1989), 414.

60. See the various readings proposed by H.-J. Kraus, *Klagelieder. BK* XX (^{3}1981), 85; H. J. Boecker, *ZBK* 21, 86 n. 34; A. B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel,* VII (1914), 53; *BHS in loc.* On the piel see below.

61. H. Barth, *Die Jesaja-Worte in der Josiazeit. WMANT* 48 (1977), 181ff.; on the nature and structure of the text, see H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1997), 193-97.

62. Plöger, *BK* XVII, 163.

the sinners. Both passages refer almost resultatively to a state that implies "catching up."

The 13 occurrences of *rāḏap* with an impersonal object all have ethical overtones; they do not aim for an isolated action but rather describe repetitive or durative pursuit. These texts include 5 of the 8 occurrences of the piel (all except Nah. 1:8 and Hos. 2:9[7] in the early wisdom of Proverbs[63]). Jenni is correct in maintaining that there is no semantic difference between the piel and the qal with an impersonal object — contra Rocco, who claims to find in the piel texts a particularly impassioned pursuit, with occasional cultic affinities.[64] There is, however, a striking diachronic concentration of piel forms in preexilic texts.

In the texts with ethical overtones, pursuit of objects with negative connotations appears in antithetical parallelism in Prov. 11:19 *(kēn-ṣᵉḏāqâ lᵉḥayyîm ûmᵉraddēp rā'â lēmôṯô),* 12:11 *(ûmᵉraddēp rêqîm),* and 28:19, probably later, which echoes these verses even to the final intensifying element.[65] Here *'bd* and *rdp* stand in antithetical parallelism, contrasting steady, cyclical agricultural labor with shortsighted "pursuit" of what is "worthless." Prov. 19:7 is fragmentary and "verbose"; its meaning can hardly be determined.[66]

We find *rāḏap* used in a similarly negative sense in the accusation in Isa. 1:23 (qal ptcp., sg.), with *šalmōnîm* as its object, as well as in Isa. 5:11, a woe upon those who pursue strong drink *(šēḵār)* early in the morning (parallel in substance to Eccl. 10:16). Pursuit of an ethically positive object appears in Hos. 6:3 (knowledge of Yahweh) and Ps. 38:21(20) *(ṭôḇ).* The same is true in Ps. 34:15b(14b) with the lovely expression *baqqēš šālôm wᵉroḏpēhû.* Almost as in military usage, the two verbs convey a special dynamism: the action of seeking, conveyed by *bqš,* is to be followed by an intensive action of movement. The verse implies that → שלום *šālôm* can never be attained in all its fullness.

In four texts righteousness is the object of pursuit: Prov. 15:9 (piel) and 21:21 (qal!), both with *ṣᵉḏāqâ;* Isa. 51:1 and Dt. 16:20 (qal), with *ṣeḏeq.* This list of texts reflects the diachronic development.[67]

4. *Adversaries in Poetry.* The Psalms use *rāḏap* almost exclusively as a term for the adversaries of the individual. As a military expression, it belongs to the group of terms that cluster about the word *'ōyēḇ,* "enemy" (→ איב *'yb*).[68] In contrast to the original usage of the root in military contexts, which is strongly situational and always implies motion, here *rdp* is often used without reference to any specific, immediate action on the part of the enemy, pointing beyond the present situation.

63. See the discussion of Prov. 13:21 above.
64. *HP,* 215-16.
65. Plöger, *BK* XVII, 331.
66. *Ibid.,* 218, 221-22; H. Ringgren, *Sprüche. ATD* XVI/1 (³1980), 76.
67. For a discussion of Dt. 16:20, the latest text, see U. Rüterswörden, *Von der politischen Gesellschaft zur Gemeinde. BBB* 65 (1987), 23; for an attempt at a theological analysis of the statement, see W. Dietrich, *EvT* 49 (1989) 232-50.
68. Keel, 107-8, 190.

The military context is still clearly in the background in Ps. 35:3,6, where Yahweh is invoked as a warrior to vanquish the enemies of the afflicted psalmist: *wᵉhārēq ḥᵃnîṯ ûsᵉḡōr* [emended: *wᵉsāḡār*[69]] *liqra'ṯ rōḏᵉpāy,* "Draw the spear and javelin against my pursuers."

Here the dynamic element of motion toward the pursued is transformed into a static image of mortal danger afflicting the psalmist. Enemies appear to be dogging the psalmist's heels, "remorseless and relentless"[70] (e.g., Ps. 7:2[1]; 31:16[15]; 69:27[26]; 119:150,157,161). The generally objective sense of the root gives way to a subjective sense of peril on the part of the psalmist, typified by the use of the nominalized participle.[71] The enemies are depersonalized, so that it is rarely possibly to distinguish clearly between physical pursuit, a psychological sense of persecution, and "projection" (e.g., 7:6[5]; 69:27[26]; 143:3).[72] Alongside the verbal use of the root, still implying motion (e.g., 71:11), the nominalized plural ptcp. (always with a pronominal suf.) *rōḏᵉpay,* "my pursuers," is the terminus of these descriptions in the laments of the individual.

In 7:2(1) there is no reason to emend *mikkol-rōḏᵉpay* to the sg. *mērōḏᵉpî,* as suggested by Kraus.[73] This verse and v. 7(6) appear rather to constitute a (secondary?) generalizing framework for the lament.[74] Besides 31:16(15) and 142:7(6), the nominalized participle appears three times (vv. 84,150,157) in the postexilic wisdom anthology Ps. 119,[75] once (v. 150) even with the explicit judgment *rōḏᵉpê zimmâ* (many mss. read the suffixed form *rōḏᵉpay*), not present elsewhere.[76] According to Ruppert,[77] the texts in Ps. 119 show clearly for the first time the motif of a causal connection between pursuit on the one hand and the "righteousness" of the psalmist and the law of Yahweh on the other. The theory that the occurrences in Ps. 119 are dependent on those in Jeremiah is hardly persuasive, since the sage who wrote Ps. 119 was already familiar with the motif from other psalms.[78] It is also unlikely that the original setting of the nominalized participle is to be sought in the royal thanksgiving hymn.[79] There is no evidence to support this theory: only in the preexilic portion of Ps. 18, in v. 38(37), does *rāḏap* occur, in what is clearly a military context.[80]

The situations in which *rāḏap* is used are classic: the unjustly accused psalmist prays to God for help (e.g., 7:2[1]; 35:3; [119:84,86]; 142:7[6]); a sick psalmist feels wounded by the concomitant abuse (e.g., 31:16[15]); both motifs may occur together

---

69. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1988), 391.
70. Keel, 192.
71. See below.
72. For a similar characterization of other terms for enemies, see Keel.
73. Kraus, 167.
74. Ruppert, *Leidende Gerechte,* 24-26.
75. On its classification see Deissler, 265-91.
76. Keel, 129ff.
77. *Leidende Gerechte,* 41-45.
78. Contra J. D. Levenson, *Ancient Israelite Religion. FS F. M. Cross* (Philadelphia, 1987), 563.
79. Ruppert, *Leidende Gerechte,* 24-26.
80. On the classification of this psalm see F. L. Hossfeld, *Freude an der Weisung des Herrn. FS H. Gross. SBB* 13 (1986), 186-87.

(e.g., 69:27[26]).[81] It is possible that certain psalms (e.g., Ps. 7 and 142) represent later prayers recited ritually by someone charged officially with an offense,[82] but the depersonalized and generalized use of *rdp* suggests a deliberate democratization of the situation, which gives the afflicted the possibility of joining in the prayers ("the description of enemies . . . has become 'stereotyped'";[83] "spacious ciphers"[84]). Here the parallelism of the concrete situation takes a back seat to expressions of psychological sympathy. This stylization also largely rules out identifying the adversaries with concrete political opponents or finding a close association with the practice of asylum.[85] The former theory has almost no support today, and the latter remains unlikely despite the striking appearance of *rdp* in Dt. 19:6 and Josh. 20:5.[86] The point at issue is the challenge to the integrity of the supplicant, who seeks from God the "justification of the righteous."[87]

This use of *rdp* appears in other literary contexts as well; e.g., *rōḏᵉpay* appears three times with the same connotations (the presumed innocence of the pursued; vague identification of the adversaries and the concrete acts of pursuit) in the confessions of Jeremiah (Jer. 15:15; 17:18; 20:11).[88] These texts appear to confirm literarily the purpose of the *rdp* statements in the laments of the individual proposed above: the prophet, in his *concrete* affliction, makes use of formulaic clichés to ask for vindication and retribution.

Job 19:22 and 28 likewise echo the situation of the lamenting psalmist, pushed to its extreme limit in the simile in v. 22: "Why do you pursue me like (a) God?" This question does not refer to the demonic aspect of El;[89] here and in vv. 28-29 pursuit is already a judicial function appropriate to God alone. The supplication of the psalmist, "May God pursue . . ." in retribution, is here inverted: Job meets with pursuit by God as well as by his presumptuous friends.

III. LXX. The LXX usually translates *rdp* with *diṓkein* or *katadiṓkein,* preferring the latter in passages where the malicious intent of the pursuer is expressed or implied (see above). Simple *diṓkein* expresses rather a neutral movement toward someone or

---

81. For a discussion of the role of the enemies in the genre of the individual lament, see Ruppert, *Leidende Gerechte,* 3-16; H. Graf Reventlow, *Gebet im AT* (Stuttgart, 1986), 163-74; Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1988), 76ff., 176; *Theology of the Psalms* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1986), 129-34. On the demonization of enemies and the relationship of the individual laments to ancient Near Eastern magical texts, see E. Gerstenberger and L. Ruppert, *Gewalt und Gewaltlosigkeit im AT. QD* 96 (1983), 111-58.

82. H. Schmidt, *Das Gebet der Angeklagten im AT. BZAW* 49 (1928); with some restrictions, Beyerlin.

83. H. Ringgren, → I, 217.

84. Gerstenberger, 144.

85. For the former see A. F. Puukko, *OTS* 8 (1950) 47-65; H. Birkeland, *Die Feinde des Individuums in der israelitischen Psalmenliteratur* (Oslo, 1933). For the latter see L. Delekat, *Asylie und Schutzorakel am Zionheiligtum* (Leiden, 1967).

86. See the surveys cited above; see also Z. W. Falk, *TRE,* IV, 318; Beyerlin, 45-53, 142.

87. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59,* 203-4.

88. On the relationship of the three texts in chs. 15, 17, and 20, see Ittmann, 76-77, 122-54.

89. As maintained by Fohrer, *KAT* XVI, 308.

something, and is therefore also used with the meaning "search after, seek," in figurative texts.[90]

IV. Dead Sea Scrolls. The root *rdp* does not appear to have been in common use at Qumran. There are 13 attested occurrences in the Dead Sea Scrolls, mostly in military contexts, as in the War Scroll: 1QM 9:5,6; 18:2,12. The purpose of pursuit — which here too follows a battle — is to annihilate the enemy; *rāḏap* followed by a further action serves as a manifestation of final and total victory. The text of 4QM[a] 13:2 clearly refers to the unrealistic exaggeration of military prowess in Lev. 26:8; Dt. 32:30; Josh. 23:10 (see above). Apart from the fact that military usage is involved the context of the fragment 6Q9 29, 3 is unclear.

A reversal of this pursuit for the purpose of annihilation appears in 1QS 10:18: "I shall not repay anyone with evil; with goodness I will pursue the person." We find *rdp* with an impersonal object in 11QT 51:15, quoting Dt. 16:20, and 4QpIs[b], quoting Isa. 5:11. In 1QpHab 11:5, Hab. 2:15 is forced "with some violence"[91] to refer to pursuit of the Teacher of Righteousness as in the Psalms. That *wyrd pwm lḥrb* in CD 1:21 likewise refers only to the Teacher of Righteousness is unlikely.[92] Here too, however, it is clear that an "upright life" provokes pursuit.

The context and meaning of the fragment 8Q5 2, 5 *(mrd pwt)* remain unclear.

Frevel

---

90. A. Oepke, "δόγμα," *TDNT,* II, 230.
91. Ruppert, *Leidende Gerechte,* 119.
92. Contra *ibid.,* 117-18.

רָהַב *rāhaḇ;* רַהַב *rahaḇ;* רֹהַב *rōhaḇ;* רְהָבִים *r[e]hāḇîm*

I. Verb: 1. Etymology; 2. Meaning. II. Nominal Derivatives. III. Rahab.

---

rāhaḇ. J. Day, *God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea. University of Cambridge Oriental Publications* 35 (1985); H. Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit* (Göttingen, [2]1921); W. Herrmann, "Das Aufleben des Mythos unter den Judäern während des babylonischen Zeitalters," *BN* 40 (1987) 97-129; E. Hertlein, "Rahab," *ZAW* 38 (1919/20) 113-54; O. Kaiser, *Die mythische Bedeutung des Meeres in Ägypten, Ugarit und Israel. BZAW* 78 ([2]1962); O. Keel, *Jahwehs Entgegnung an Ijob. FRLANT* 121 (1978); C. Kloos, *Yhwh's Combat with the Sea* (Amsterdam, 1986); J. C. de Moor, *An Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit. Nisaba* 16 (Leiden, 1987); S. I. L. Norin, *Er spaltete das Meer. CBOT* 9 (1997); C. Petersen, *Mythos im AT. BZAW* 157 (1982); H. Ringgren, "Yahvé et Rahab-Léviatan," *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux. FS*

I. Verb. 1. *Etymology.* The root *rhb* is well attested in the various Semitic languages, although surprisingly no cognates have been found in Ugaritic or Phoenician/Punic. Related words include Akk. *ra'ābu,* in Neo-Babylonian also *raḫābu,* "tremble, rage,"[1] with a number of nominal derivatives, including particularly *rūbu, rubbu,* "ebullition, rage," since it is also used for the surging of water; Arab. *rahiba,* "be afraid, fear," also *rahab,* "fear," and *rahib,* "fearsome."[2] Middle Hebrew uses the verb in the hiphil with the meaning "make proud"; Jewish Aramaic has a similar usage. Both stages of the language also use an S stem of this root with the meaning "press, impel," in Aramaic also "hasten." This latter sense appears also in Mand. *srhb,* "be quick, hasten, hurry."[3] In Syriac the verb means "hasten, be excited," of rivers also "flow swiftly."

2. *Meaning.* It is difficult to determine the precise meaning of the verb; it occurs only four times in the OT, and the contexts do not suggest a clear definition. The broad range of meanings of the cognates noted above means that Semitic parallels are only of limited help. There are also textual problems, especially in Prov. 6:3. The MT reads: *lēḵ hiṯrappēs ûrᵉhaḇ rē'eyḵā.* The verb *rps* is problematic. Some lexicons associate it with the qal of *rpś,* "befoul," but that meaning is inappropriate.[4] Gemser's citation of Akk. *ina repsi,* "at a stroke" — he translates the Hebrew expression as "go without delay"[5] — does not help, since *ripsu,* the noun in question, means "mist."[6] Also forced are attempts to connect *rps* with Akk. *rapāsu,* "strike, thrash," with the further semantic development > "swallow one's pride."[7] Most likely the text is corrupt. Following the LXX, *KBL²* suggests the emendation *wᵉ'al tiṯrappeh,* "do not show yourself slack." The remaining *s* might belong with *rhb,*[8] in which case the verb would be in the saphel, with the meaning "order, urge, press."[9] The conjugational form indicates a late origin.[10]

The text of Ps. 138:3 is probably also corrupt. The versions suggest (although the witness of LXX is ambiguous) that the verb should be *rbh (tarbēnî);*[11] this reading would be similar to Ps. 18:36(35). Staerk and Kittel advocate the correct division of the hemistichs; the text should be translated: "You made me great; into my soul came strength."[12]

H. Cazelles. AOAT 212 (1981), 387-93; K.-D. Schunck, "Jes 30,6-8 und die Deutung des Rahab im AT," *ZAW* 78 (1966) 48-56; M.-J. Seux, *Hymnes et prières aux dieux de Babylonie et d'Assyrie* (Paris, 1976); M. K. Wakeman, *God's Battle with the Monster* (Leiden, 1973).

1. *AHw,* II, 932-33.
2. Wehr, 362.
3. *MdD,* 337.
4. *GesB, BDB.*
5. B. Gemser, *Sprüche Salomos. HAT* XVI (²1963), 36. Cf. NRSV.
6. *AHw,* II, 987.
7. W. McKane, *Proverbs. OTL* (1992), 322-23, citing Driver.
8. *BHS.*
9. M. H. Segal, *Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew* (Oxford, 1927), §149; Jastrow, 1023.
10. Gemser, 37-38.
11. *BHS.*
12. W. Staerk, *Psalmen. SAT* III/1 (²1920), 91; R. Kittel, *Psalmen. KAT* XIII (⁶1920), 416.

The occurrence of *rhb* in Cant. 6:5 is clear: the verb refers to an overwhelming emotion.[13] Würthwein translates the stich: "Turn away your eyes from me, for they terrify me."[14] The meaning of the hiphil fits well with the Arabic verb of the same root. Kopf has made the original suggestion that the hiphil of *rhb* here should be translated "enchant," a meaning common in Modern Hebrew.[15] Apart from the problem of semantic polarity,[16] however, the absence of any early witness to this meaning argues against his proposal.

Isa. 3:5 uses *rhb* in parallel with *ngś* niphal, traditionally translated "(op)press."[17] The best point of departure is v. 5b, with the contrast between young and old, base and honorable. The verse focuses on the question of social status. The inversion of social values in this passage suggests that the verb describes a refusal to respect persons in a position of authority. (In this context Rashi's proposed interpretation of *rhb* as *ytgdl,* "behave arrogantly," is noteworthy;[18] it also reflects the meaning of the root *rhb* in Middle Hebrew and Jewish Aramaic.) Verbs expressing the exercise of authority can be constructed with the prep. *bᵉ,* "over";[19] in Isa. 3 this is true of *mšl* (v. 4), *ngś* (v. 5), and *rhb.* Furthermore, the anarchy described in Isa. 3 does not reflect just the absence of authority but also the authority of all over all (cf. Jgs. 21:25). The construction of *rhb* with *bᵉ* suggests that the verb has to do with the exercise of authority.[20]

II. Nominal Derivatives. This reading is supported by a nominal derivative of the root proposed as a conjectural emendation in Isa. 14:4, where the text of 1QIsᵃ reads *mrhbh* instead of *mdhbh* (as does an early edition cited in Gesenius's comm.). Because an agent noun is expected, Wildberger proposes emending the text to *marhîḇ* and translates: "Ah, how the despot came to an end, the 'tyrant' has ceased."[21] (The reading *mdhbh,* however, is attested in 1QH 3:25; 12:18; it would mean something like "destruction."[22]) The LXX (*epispoudastḗs,* the title of an Alexandrian official[23]) apparently interpreted the word as a personal noun.

Here, as in Isa. 3:5, the word parallels *ngś;* the participle means "dictator,"[24] with overtones of coercion. The verb *ngś* is a verb of motion and can also express the exercise of authority. We may assume the same spectrum of meanings for *rhb,* which can denote a surge of emotions as well as the exercise of authority. The few certain occurrences display a broad semantic differentiation emerging from a basic meaning something like "seethe," as reflected in the noun *rahaḇ.*

---

13. M. H. Pope, *Song of Songs. AB* VII C (1977), 564-65.
14. E. Würthwein, *Das Hohelied. HAT* XVIII (^{2}1969), 59.
15. L. Kopf, *VT* 9 (1959) 273-74.
16. H. H. Hospers, *ZAH* 1 (1988) 32ff.
17. For a different view → E. Lipiński, IX, 214.
18. See the earlier comms., esp. those of E. F. C. Rosenmüller and W. Gesenius.
19. *BDB,* 90.
20. See Wakeman, 59, 62 n. 3.
21. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1997), 41, 43.
22. H. Ringgren, *ErIsr* 20 (1989) 174-75.
23. J. Ziegler, *ATA* XII/3 (1934) 200.
24. → V, 214.

The two nominal derivatives *rōhaḇ* and *rᵉhāḇîm* also involve textual problems. According to the lexicons and comms., the word *rōhaḇ* in Ps. 90:10 means "pride," a meaning that finds support in the Aramaic cognate. The versions, however, presuppose *rubbām.*[25] Various translations have been proposed for *rᵉhāḇîm* in Ps. 40:5(4), e.g., "defiant" or "ungracious," reflecting the assumed meaning of *rhb.* Sir. 13:8 suggests that *rhb* could also have the meaning "be foolish, err";[26] but here too there has been no lack of proposed emendations, e.g., "Take care not to overextend yourself,"[27] probably reading *rḥb.* Furthermore, the text of Ps. 40:5 is uncertain: the versions presuppose *hblym.*[28]

III. Rahab. The noun *rahaḇ,* denoting a personified entity, is — from the perspective of Hebrew — a *qaṭl* form from the verb *rhb.*[29] There has been no lack of attempts to find Rahab outside the OT. Zimmern claimed to read *rebbu,* which could be the Assyrian equivalent of Heb. *rahaḇ,* in a text describing a battle with a dragon.[30] This reading, however, turned out to be incorrect; the correct reading is *labbu,* "lion."[31] This etymological proposal must therefore be rejected. Norin proposes a derivation from Egyp. *rꜣ-ḥꜣb,* "the crooked serpent."[32] Apart from the phonological difficulties of this derivation, recognized even by Norin as problematic, the central difficulty is the incorporation of mythological themes into the Judaism of the Babylonian period. As Herrmann has shown, Mesopotamian and Canaanite materials converge in the figure of Rahab; direct Egyptian influence of any significance would be a secondary development.

Unlike *ltn* and *tnn, rahaḇ* does not appear in the Ugaritic texts. This absence probably cannot be ascribed to the accidents of textual transmission, since we have a list that includes a significant number of monsters, many of which do not reappear in later traditions.[33]

Akk. *rūbu/rubbu* (see above) points to a Mesopotamian background for the figure of Rahab. Among other uses, this expression describes the surging of water, as in an account of a military campaign by Shamshi-Adad V, which describes a city as situated "in the middle of the river, in the flood of the water *(ina ru-ub-bi mê).*"[34] More significant is a passage in a prayer to Marduk: *i-na nab-li-šu . . . ša tam-tim gal-la-ti i-sa-am-bu-' ru-ub-bu-ša,* "At his flame . . . toss the waves of the surging sea."[35] The whole text

25. H. Gunkel, *Psalmen. HKAT* II/2 (⁵1968), 401.
26. R. Smend, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach* (1906), 124, citing Ps. 40:5(4).
27. G. Sauer, *JSHRZ,* III/5, 537.
28. C. A. Briggs and E. G. Briggs, *Comm. on the Book of Psalms. ICC,* 2 vols., I, 358.
29. *BLe,* §61t′.
30. Cited by Gunkel, 418 n. 2.
31. F. Hrozný, *MVÄG* 8/5 (1903), 106ff.; *AHw,* II, 526.
32. Norin, 74-75.
33. *KTU,* 1.3, III, 36ff.; de Moor, 10ff.; S. E. Loewenstamm, *Comparative Studies in Bible and Oriental Literatures. AOAT* 204 (1980), 360.
34. B. Schrader, ed., *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek,* I (Berlin, 1889), 184/186.
35. E. Ebeling, *Die akkadische Gebetsserie "Handerhebung"* (Berlin, 1953), 94, 16-17; Seux, 77.

is full of allusions to the creation epic Enuma Elish; it has been suggested that the lines in question refer to Marduk's battle with Tiamat.[36] It may be possible to categorize Heb. *rahab* as a loan translation.

In the OT figure of the chaos dragon, we must distinguish a Babylonian background, the subject of Gunkel's study with its emphasis on parallels from Enuma Elish, and a Canaanite background, to which the texts from Ugarit bear witness.[37] If there are analogies between Rahab and the figure of Tiamat in Enuma Elish, we are dealing with an act of creation located — and completed — in the primeval age: from Tiamat, Marduk forms the earth and the dome of the sky in their present form. The Canaanite material has a different emphasis: the chaos monsters, though vanquished, still represent a threat.[38] This ongoing danger is indicated both by the frequent repetition of allusions to the conflict and by an adjuration addressed to Baal.[39] De Moor and Spronk have greatly clarified the meaning of the latter text.[40] Baal is adjured to battle the dragon *(tnn)* and the arrows of the god Rashaph, and to help a young girl menstruate. A passage from the Krt Epic may suggest sympathetic magic against the *tnn*, making use of figurines.[41]

This understanding of chaos is echoed in the book of Job. The second speech of God (Job 40:1–41:26[Eng. 34]) answers Job's charge in 9:24 that Yahweh is criminal *(rāšā')*. Talk of the chaos monsters makes clear that there is evil that must be repeatedly overcome. God's words give a certain scope to "chaotic and evil powers in this world, thus freeing God from direct responsibility for everything that happens in the world."[42] The figures named here include Leviathan (it has been shown that we are dealing here with echoes of Canaanite figures[43]) but not Rahab, who comes from a different world. Since Rahab does not appear at Ugarit and is not found in the preexilic texts of the OT, we must assume that the association of Rahab with the other figures is a product of the exilic period.

Rahab appears twice in the book of Job, in 9:13 and 26:12. The first text, "God need not turn back his anger; the helpers of Rahab had to bow beneath him," shows that God's anger can be aroused at any time against someone without objection, just as God once humbled Rahab's helpers. The change of tense shows that the event lies in the past, in contrast to vv. 5ff.[44] The mention of Rahab's helpers recalls the auxiliaries of Tiamat and Kingu in EnEl, IV, 69,107.

At Ugarit, Baal also has helpers *(t'dr)*.[45] They appear in lists of deities and in sacrifi-

36. Seux, 77 n. 20.
37. Herrmann, 118.
38. De Moor, 175 n. 1.
39. *KTU*, 1.82.
40. J. C. de Moor and K. Spronk, *UF* 16 (1984) 237-50; for a translation see *TUAT*, II, 336ff.; de Moor, 175ff.
41. *KTU*, 1.16, V, 29ff.; de Moor, 200.
42. Keel, 157.
43. Day, 62ff.
44. Day, 40.
45. W. Herrmann, *UF* 14 (1982) 96-97.

cial texts,[46] but there are no further details concerning these figures. They should probably not be identified with the helpers in Enuma Elish and Job 9:13, since Baal is typologically a different deity than Tiamat and Rahab.

Preeminent among Tiamat's auxiliaries are eleven figures in the form of dragons or serpents; it is their fate to be trampled by Marduk, who makes statues of them to recall his victory.[47]

In the context of the book of Job, the important point is that these helpers have been vanquished but are pictured as surviving.[48] Their survival makes it reasonable to see in them the chaos monsters of God's second response.[49] The chaos monsters of Canaanite origin are conjoined with Rahab by being incorporated into a concept of Babylonian origin.

These same figures are also associated in 26:12-13. Only Rahab is mentioned by name, in parallel with "the Sea." The context is a hymn to the power and creative energy of God. According to Fohrer, the statement "By his wind the heavens were made fair; his hand pierced the fleeing serpent" (v. 13) is an allusion to EnEl, IV, 131-32, which describes the north wind as taking away the blood of slain Tiamat.[50] Both the creation theology of the context and the echo of Enuma Elish indicate Babylonian influence. In addition, there is a striking Ugaritic parallel that uses much the same language (cf. Isa. 27:1).[51] In describing the destruction of *ltn,* the text states that Baal covered the heavens with the monster's entrails.[52] Thus Job 26:13 can also be read against the background of Canaanite mythologoumena. If the victory over Rahab is also painted in the colors of the Canaanite myth, the overall context of the book of Job nevertheless shows the difference between Rahab and Leviathan. Their synoptic presentation first appears here — as in Deutero-Isaiah — and does not indicate a previous association in the preexilic period.

The occurrence in Deutero-Isaiah (Isa. 51:9) speaks explicitly of a primordial event *(kîmê qedem, dōrôt ʿôlāmîm).* The parallelism with *yām* and *tᵉhôm* in v. 10 led Gunkel to assume that the text refers to the drying up of the primeval sea at creation. "Rahab is thus the personification of *thwm,* of chaos."[53] Here the Babylonian background of the text shines through, but the identification with the *tannîn* also points in the direction of Canaan. The drying up of the primeval sea is formulated in the terminology drawn from both realms, with echoes of the exodus event: Yahweh's primeval act is used to interpret the historical event of the exodus, with which it becomes conjoined.[54]

In Ps. 89:10-11(9-10), too, *rahab* parallels "the sea." Here Yahweh's dominion over

46. *TUAT,* II, 303, 305ff.
47. EnEl, I, 132ff.; IV, 118; V, 74, 75.
48. Petersen, 141-42.
49. Day, 41.
50. G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (^{2}1989), 385.
51. *KTU,* 1.5, I, 1-4.
52. M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *UF* 12 (1980) 406.
53. Gunkel, 32.
54. Herrmann, 98ff.; → IV, 134-35.

the sea is formulated in the present tense, whereas the battle with Rahab is formulated in the past, as a primeval event. Other enemies are brought into the conflict alongside Rahab; they are not destroyed,[55] however, but merely scattered. This passage recalls the helpers of Rahab in Job 9:13. The verses that follow go on to speak of God's creation. The use of the verb *br'* is noteworthy, and probably rules out a preexilic date for this passage.[56] We also find *rhb* in the context of creation in Sir. 43:25 (text uncertain).

In Isa. 30:7 ("Therefore I name her *rhb* 'who has been tamed'" [reading *hammošbāṯ*[57]]), Rahab is an emblematic name for Egypt. The verb *qr'* followed by *l*ᵉ means "name" and is usually followed by the name given (here Rahab). Since *lāzō'ṯ* is feminine, its antecedent must be Egypt in the preceding stich. But there "Egypt" is itself a gloss, and so the mention of Rahab cannot be Isaianic.[58] Egypt is also called "Rahab" in Ps. 87:4.

Rüterswörden

55. On the meaning of *dk'*, → III, 203-4.
56. → II, 245; Petersen, 175-76; Herrmann, 114 n. 88.
57. Petersen, 135-36; cf. *KBL*², 947.
58. B. Duhm, *Jesaja. HKAT* III/1 (⁵1963), 217-18; Petersen, 136.

רָוָה *rāwâ*; רָוֶה *rāweh*; רְוָיָה *rᵉwāyâ*; רִי *rî*; יוֹרֶה *yôreh*

I. Etymology. II. OT: 1. Qal; 2. Piel; 3. Hiphil; 4. Niphal or Hophal; 5. Derivatives. III. Dead Sea Scrolls. IV. LXX.

I. Etymology. The root *rwy* (in Hebrew > *rwh*) appears in Northwest and Southwest Semitic with the meanings (intransitive) "drink one's fill, quaff," hence "become drunk," and (transitive) "ply with drink, water abundantly" (humans and animals), "irrigate" (land, plants). Syr. *rᵉwā'*, *rᵉwî* means only "become drunk, intoxicated"; the aphel means "give drink, water, make drunk."[1] Arab. *rawiya (a)* means "drink one's fill, quench one's thirst; be irrigated, be watered"; *rawā (i)* means "bring water, water," II and IV, "quench someone's thirst; water; drench; moisten, wet."[2] Compare also OSA *rwy*, "irrigation" (in the context of a cistern or aqueduct irrigating gardens and palm

rāwâ. M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography X," *Bibl* 53 (1972) 386-403, esp. 389.

1. *LexSyr*, 719-20.
2. Wehr, 369.

groves);[3] Eth. *rawaya* and *rawya,* "drink copiously; water"; *arwaya* II.1 also "make drunk."[4]

II. OT. The verb occurs 13 (16) times in the OT: 3 times (plus 1 emendation) in the qal, 4 (plus 1 emendation) in the piel, 5 (plus 1 emendation) in the hiphil, and once (depending on whether an emendation is accepted) in the niphal or hophal. Surprisingly, the verb and its nominal derivatives do not occur in narrative texts but only in the poetic or elevated language of prophecy (5 times in Isaiah, 3 in Jeremiah, and once in Hosea) and wisdom literature (3 times in Proverbs, twice in Psalms, and once in Lamentations). The verb is accordingly used for the most part metaphorically (in the qal and piel); the literal meaning (a third of the occurrences) appears only in a transitive or causative sense ("water"; 4 times hiphil and once piel). The parallel use of → שׂבע *śāḇaʿ,* "be sated, satiate" (Jer. 31:14; 46:10; Lam. 3:15 [hiphil]), and *millēʾ* piel, "fill," shows that the root implies copious and occasionally excessive drinking.

1. *Qal.* The qal of the verb is used only metaphorically. Ps. 36:9(Eng. 8), in the context of a hymnic supplication, speaks of the abundant blessings of God's presence bestowed on those who seek refuge in the sanctuary; among other things, "they feast on the fat of your house" *(yirwᵉyun,* lit. "they quaff" the fat, in parallel with *šāqâ* hiphil, "give drink"). This lapidary expression refers to the fat of sacrificial victims, forbidden for human consumption (Lev. 3:16-17), which serves here (as in Jer. 31:14) as a symbol of refreshing abundance.

In Jeremiah's description of the battle at the Euphrates (605 B.C.E.), which proves to be a day of retribution and a hecatomb of Yahweh, he uses the metaphor of a devouring sword, which is sated *(śāḇᵉʿâ)* and drinks its fill of the enemies' blood (46:10). In Isa. 34:7, in a oracle against Edom that likewise speaks of a bloody sword and a hecatomb of Yahweh, the land drinks its fill or is drunk with blood (LXX *methysthēsetai;* instead of the piel *riwwᵉṯâ,* it is preferable to read the qal *rāwᵉṯâ,* as in Jer. 46:10, following LXX, Syr., Tg., and Vg.).

While the object in these three passages is introduced by *min,* in Prov. 7:18 it stands in the accusative. Here the adulterous woman entices the young, naive man with the words, "Come, let us intoxicate ourselves with love" *(nirweh ḏōḏîm).*

2. *Piel.* The piel has factitive and causative meaning. According to Prov. 5:19, the breasts of a beloved wife are to "intoxicate" her husband always (in 5:15-16 the wife is described as a cistern or well; in Cant. 7:10[9] and 8:2 caresses are likened to drinking fine wine); her love is to make him constantly giddy *(šāḡâ).* According to Jer. 31:14, the joy of God's people returning from Babylonian captivity is to culminate in a celebration on Mt. Zion, when Yahweh will "saturate" *(wᵉriwwêṯî;* cf. Ps. 36:9[8]) the hearts *(nep̱eš)* of the priests with (sacrificial) fat (cf. Arab. *yurawwī nafsahu,* "slake his

3. ContiRossini, 239; Biella, 482-83.
4. *LexLingAeth,* 306-7.

thirst") and satiate *(śāḇaʿ)* his people with his bounty. Ps. 65 praises the Lord, who sends showers and blessings (v. 11[10]), "watering the furrows abundantly." In a lament over the desolation of the vineyards of Moab (Isa. 16:9), Yahweh says that he will "drench" Heshbon and Elealeh with his tears (double acc.). (The form *ʾᵃrayyāweḵ* is impossible,[5] probably arising from *ʾrwyk* by metathesis, a possibility supported by the obviously corrupt *ʾrzyk* of 1QIsᵃ. The correct reading is *ʾᵃrawwāyēḵ.*)

The form *riwwᵉṯâ* in Isa. 34:5 was read by LXX *(emethýsthē)* and by Vg. *(inebriatus est)* as *rāwᵉṯâ* (qal); it should be emended to *tērāʾeh* (cf. 1QIsᵃ *trʾh* and Tg. *tiṯgallê):* the sword of the Lord "appears" in the heavens.

3. *Hiphil.* The transitive meaning "give to drink, water" appears in the literal sense in the causative stem. The epilogue of Deutero-Isaiah (Isa. 55:10) likens the trustworthiness of God's word to the rain that comes down from heaven and waters *(hirwâ)* the earth, making it bring forth and sprout. Hosea (6:3, emended) promises the people who are called to know God that in their hopes and expectations they will experience the Lord like the spring rains *(malqôš)* that "water" the earth (reading the hiphil *marweh* instead of *yôreh* [hiphil of *yārâ* II], with the Tg. [*mᵉrawwê*] and Syr. [*marwēʾ*]).

The agony of the poet lamenting the destruction of Jerusalem is described figuratively as being filled (*śāḇaʿ* hiphil) by God with bitterness and sated with wormwood (acc., Lam. 3:15).

In a judgment oracle of Yahweh against Israel (Isa. 43:22-28), God levels the frightful charge that Israel's sins have transformed the Lord into a servant, perverting the sacrificial ritual and no longer sating Yahweh *(hirwîṯānî)* with the fat (acc.) of Israel's sacrifices. In a prophecy of salvation in the form of a blessing on the discouraged exiles of Judah (Jer. 31:25), God promises to satisfy *(hirwêṯî)* the weary soul or vital force *(nep̄eš ʿᵃyēp̄â)* and replenish *(millēʾṯî)* the faint soul or vital force — just as eating and drinking restore inward and outward strength.

4. *Niphal or Hophal.* In Prov. 11:25 the blessing that follows generosity and the notion of recompense find expression in a paronomastic maxim: "One who give copious drink (*marweh,* hiphil ptcp.) will receive copious drink [*yôreʾ* < **yôreh*]." (The latter form is read either as the hophal *yûreh* or the niphal *yērāweh;*[6] the emendation of *BHK* and *BHS,* based on Syr., takes an entirely different tack: *mᵉʾārēr* and *yûʾar,* from *ʾārar,* "curse.")

5. *Derivatives.*

a. *rāweh.* The adj. *rāweh,* "sated with drink, irrigated" (cf. Arab. *riwā,* "well watered"; *rayyān,* "sated with drink, well watered, lush, flourishing") is used to describe soil or plants. For example, Jer. 31:12 uses the image of a well-watered garden, fertile and lush, for the riches and abundance awaiting those returning from

5. *GK,* §75dd; *BLe,* §57t″.
6. See, respectively, *GK,* §69w; *HAL,* III, 1195.

exile; Isa. 58:11 uses the same image to describe the reward of the Israelites who love their neighbors.

Dt. 29:18(19) is difficult, not least because of the interpretation of *s^e^pôṯ* as "take away, carry off."[7] "That which is watered" *(hārāwâ)* is contrasted with "that which is dry" *(haṣṣ^e^mē'â)*. Understood literally, this could mean that the idolater who scorns the law of Yahweh turns in secret to a fertility deity, "that an abundance of water may end the drought" (EÜ). A figurative interpretation is also possible, in which "the irrigated and the dried up (land)" serves as a merism for all, both the good and the evil — who are all snatched away without distinction (LXX and 1QS 2:14).

In Job 10:15 *r^e^'ēh* (left untranslated by LXX and Vg.) should be read as *rā'eh;* also possible, though not necessary, is the conjectural emendation *r^e^wēh,* "steeped" (in disgrace and affliction).

b. *r^e^wāyâ.* The noun *r^e^wāyâ* means "abundance" (of drink; cf. Arab. *rawiyy,* "overflowing (water); copious drink; a cloud that rains large drops"; Syr. *rawāyā',* "drunkard; thirsty"). In Ps. 23:5 a sacrificial meal is prepared demonstratively for the persecuted psalmist before the very eyes of the accusers; this meal shows Yahweh to be a sheltering host, whose abundant goodness and kindness find expression in the overflowing cup of wine.

In Ps. 66:12 it is reasonable to emend *lār^e^wāyâ* to *lār^e^wāḥâ,* "(you brought us out) to a spacious place," i.e., "to freedom," following LXX, Syr., and Tg.

c. *rî.* Also a hapax legomenon is the noun *rî,* "moisture" (cf. Arab. *riyy* and *rayy,* "[artificial] watering [of the soil], rain"). The speech of Elihu in Job 37:1-13 with awe and wonder portrays God's omnipotence displayed in natural phenomena; v. 11 states that God fills the clouds with moisture.

Ps. 104:13 reads *mipp^e^rî ma'^a^śêḵā,* "with the fruit of your work" (also LXX and Vg.); Kraus has proposed emending this to *mērî '^a^sāmêḵā,* "from the moisture of your chambers" (the earth is satisfied), a good parallel to v. 13a, "he who waters the mountains from his lofty home."[8]

d. *yôreh.* The noun *yôreh* (< *yawreh < *yarweh), with a preformative *y,* which occurs twice (plus a conjectural occurrence), denotes the "early rain," which falls from the beginning of October through the end of December.[9] It invariably appears in conjunction with *malqôš,* the "late rain." As master of the forces of nature, Yahweh has endued the natural order with his blessing; he will vouchsafe to the land the early and late rains in due season if Israel hearkens to the commandments of Yahweh, its God. Thus Dt. 11:14 portrays to the people the blessing associated with obedience to the law. The prophecy of Jeremiah in Jer. 5:20-25, spoken during a drought, accuses the Israelites (v. 24) of refusing to fear the Lord, who gives the rain (the explication "the early rain and the late rain" is a secondary gloss[10]) in its season and keeps the weeks appointed for the harvest. In consequence of their sins, there has been no rain. When the people

7. → X, 305.
8. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1989), 296, 300.
9. *AuS,* I, 115-30.
10. *BHS.*

punished by drought and a plague of locusts return to the Lord with prayer and fasting, Joel (Joel 2:23) proclaims the good news that Yahweh will once again cause the early rain (34 mss. read *yôreh* instead of *môreh*) and the late rain to pour down.

III. Dead Sea Scrolls. There is one occurrence each of the derivatives *rāwâ* (?) and *r^ewāyâ* in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Dt. 29:18(19) is quoted in 1QS 2:14 *(hrwwh* or *hrwyh?);* 1QpHab 11:14 describes the wicked priest as walking in the way of intemperance (*hrwyh;* the appended final clause *lm'n spwt hṣm'h* appears to allude to Dt. 29:18[19]). Two other occurrences (1QH fr. 58, 6; 4Q381 78, 6) appear in fragmentary contexts.

IV. LXX. The LXX usually translates *rāwâ* with a verbal form of *methýskein* (act.: "make drunk"; pass.: "become drunk, intoxicated"). The qal is represented by the pass. *methysthḗsesthai* (in Prov. 7:18 by *apolaúein,* "enjoy"), the piel and hiphil by the aorist *eméthysa* or *emethýsthēn.* In many passages (niphal, Prov. 11:25; piel, Prov. 5:19; hiphil, Isa. 43:24; Hos. 6:3) the LXX reads the text differently.

Maiberger

רוח *rwḥ;* רֵיחַ *rêaḥ*

I. Etymology. II. Verb: 1. Occurrences; 2. Usage. III. Noun: 1. Occurrences; 2. Usage. IV. LXX. V. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Etymology. Most of the etymological questions associated with the root *rwḥ/ryḥ* still elude definitive answers.[1] In this connection we need only recall that it is not clear yet whether we must distinguish two different roots, *rwḥ* and *ryḥ,* in Hebrew.[2] The first ostensibly means "be spacious, make spacious for someone, feel relieved" (qal only in

---

rwḥ. R. Albertz and C. Westermann, "רוּחַ *rû^aḥ* Geist," *THAT,* II, 726-53; G. A. Anderson, *Sacrifices and Offerings in Ancient Israel. HSM* 41 (1987); P. A. H. de Boer, "An Aspect of Sacrifice. II. God's Fragrance," *SVT* 23 (1972), 37-47; G. Delling, "ὀσμή," *TDNT,* V, 493-95; M. Haran, "The Uses of Incense in the Ancient Israelite Ritual," *VT* 10 (1960) 113-29; J. Hoftijzer, "Das sogenannte Feueropfer," *Hebräische Wortforschung. FS W. Baumgartner. SVT* 16 (1967), 114-34; L. Köhler, *ThAT* ([4]1966), esp. 176-77; M. Löhr, *Das Räucheropfer im AT* (1927); D. Lys, *Rûach. Études d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 56 (1962); R. Rendtorff, "Genesis 8,21 und die Urgeschichte des Jahwisten," *KuD* 7 (1961) 69-78; *idem, Studien zur Geschichte des Opfers im Alten Israel. WMANT* 24 (1967); D. Winton Thomas, "A Study in Hebrew Synonyms," *ZA* 10 (1935) 311-14; G. L. Young, "The Smelling of the Sweet Savor of Noah's Sacrifice," *BSt* 3 (1905) 64-67.

→ רוּחַ *rûaḥ.*

1. → רוּחַ *rûaḥ.*

2. As argued, e.g., by *GesTh,* 1270-73; *GesB,* 748-50; *LexHebAram,* 760.

1 S. 16:23 and Job 32:20; pual ptcp., "spacious," in Jer. 22:14), and is reflected in such nouns as *rewaḥ*, "expanse, space" (Gen. 32:17[Eng. 16]) or "deliverance" (Est. 4:14), and *r^ewāḥâ*, "respite" (Ex. 8:11[15]; Lam. 3:56). One may compare, for example, Arab. *rawiḥa* IV, "cause to rest," VIII and X, "find rest," along with the nouns *rāḥa* and *istirāḥa*, "rest";[3] Rabbinic Heb. *rāwaḥ* and Aram. *r^ewaḥ*, which in the peal means "be spacious";[4] and Syr. *r^ewaḥ*, "be spacious."[5]

The second root *rwḥ/ryḥ* would then mean "breathe, blow, smell," appearing in the OT primarily in the hiphil (11 times), with the nouns → רוּחַ *rûaḥ*, "wind, spirit," *rēaḥ*, "odor" (58 occurrences in the Hebrew OT and 1 in Biblical Aramaic),[6] as well as the hapax legomenon *raḥaṯ*, "winnowing shovel" (Isa. 30:24). Cognates would include Arab. *rāḥa* I, "blow, be windy, be refreshed," IV *(arwāḥa)*, "smell bad," X *(istarwaḥa)*, "inhale, smell," and nouns such as *rīḥ*, "odor, scent";[7] Eth. *rĕḥĕya*, "waft, smell"; *reḥī*, "perfume";[8] Ugar. *rḥ*, "wind, scent";[9] Pun. *rḥ*, "spirit";[10] Aram. *rwḥ* (since Sefire III, 2);[11] also Rabbinic Hebrew and Aramaic, as well as Syriac.[12] As one might expect, this approach is in part a question of definition. Not uncommonly, though, more recent scholars assume a single Common Semitic root *rwḥ/ryḥ*,[13] citing as a parallel Akk. *napāšu*, which means both "expand" and "blow, breathe."[14]

II. Verb.

1. *Occurrences.* The Hebrew verb *rwḥ* occurs 14 times in the OT: twice in the qal, once in the pual, and 11 times in the hiphil.

2. *Usage.*

a. *Qal.* Viewed in their contexts, the two occurrences of the qal clearly convey the meaning "it is spacious" for *(l^e)* someone — i.e., the person feels relieved. The story of David's rise recounts how an "evil spirit" *(rûaḥ hārāʿâ)* would repeatedly come upon Saul; but when the young David played the lyre, "Saul would be relieved *(w^erāwaḥ l^ešāʾûl)* and feel better, and the evil spirit would depart from him" (1 S. 16:23). In a

---

3. Lane, I/3, 1177-83; R. Dozy, *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes*, II (Leiden, ²1927), 565-68.

4. Jastrow, 1456-57.

5. *LexSyr*, 718-19.

6. See III below.

7. Lane, Dozy.

8. *LexLingAeth*, 274.

9. *UT*, no. 2308.

10. *KAI*, 79.11; *DISO*, 276; R. S. Tomback, *A Comparative Semitic Lexicon of the Phoenician and Punic Languages. SBLDS* 32 (1978), 303.

11. J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefîre. BietOr* 19 (1967), 104; *KAI*, 224. See also P. Fronzaroli, *AANLR* VIII/20 (1965), 139, 145.

12. Jastrow; *LexSyr.*

13. Including *HAL*, III, 1195-96; Lys, 19; H. Cazelles, *Von Kanaan bis Kerala. FS J. P. M. van der Ploeg. AOAT* 211 (1982), 75-90.

14. *AHw*, II, 736-37; Albertz and Westermann, 727; cf. Winton Thomas.

similar vein, in the introduction to Elihu's speeches (Job 32–37), Elihu declares that he will not find relief until he speaks (32:20).

b. *Pual.* The only instance of a pual form occurs in Jeremiah's judgment oracle against Jehoiakim (Jer. 22:13-19): "I will build myself a spacious house with large upper rooms *(waʿᵃlîyôṯ meruwwāḥîm)*" (v. 14).

c. *Hiphil.* The hiphil of *rwḥ* usually means "smell"; the subject may be humans, God, or gods made by human hands. Occasionally it means "scent" (Job 39:25, subj.: a horse). A unique statement in the story of Samson (Jgs. 16:9) speaks of a strand of fiber that snaps when it "smells" the fire, i.e., when it comes too near the fire.

Only a few passages speak of persons sensing a smell: the aged Isaac can smell the odor of Esau's garments; the Priestly regulations governing worship in the tabernacle forbid private imitation of the highly sacred incense prepared by a perfumer *(qeṭōreṯ rōqaḥ)* "in order to smell it" (*lehārîaḥ bâ,* Ex. 30:38).[15]

Most texts refer to Yahweh or the gods, and naturally imply anthropomorphic conceptions; normally they appear in cultic contexts. Concerning the sacrifice *(ʿôlâ)* offered by Noah after the flood, Gen. 8:21 (usually assigned to J) says: "Then Yahweh smelled the pleasing odor" *(wayyāraḥ yhwh ʾeṯ-rēaḥ hannîḥōaḥ);* the verb is used in a technical cultic sense. Clearly the story incorporates traditional elements from outside Israel, which appear already in the Akkadian deluge story of Atrahasis (III, V, 34-35) and the Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic (XI, 159-61): "The gods smelled the odor, the gods gathered like flies about him as he offered sacrifice."[16]

Traditional elements of a similar nature appear also in the story of the second occasion when David spares the life of Saul (1 S. 26). David says to the king: "If Yahweh has stirred you up against me, may he smell a grain offering" (*yāraḥ minḥâ,* v. 19).[17] Conversely, Amos declares that Yahweh will not smell the solemn assemblies of the Israelites (Am. 5:21). And a judgment pronouncement in P (Lev. 26:31) sounds like the inverse of Gen. 8:21: "And I will not smell your pleasing odor" *(welōʾ ʾārîaḥ berêaḥ nîḥōḥᵃḵem).* It is clear that in cultic contexts "smell" means the same as "accept."[18]

Gods made by human hands are incapable of either accepting or rejecting sacrificial offerings. The simply cannot smell (Dt. 4:28), a fact declared liturgically in praise of the living God (Ps. 115:6).

Uniquely isolated is Isaiah's description of the king whose coming is expected to bring salvation: *wahᵃrîḥô beyirʾaṯ yhwh,* "and his smelling is in the fear of Yahweh" (Isa. 11:3). This statement is totally out of place in the context and is apparently the result of dittography.[19]

---

15. See also Löhr; Haran; → קטרת *qeṭōreṯ.*

16. *AOT,* 179; *ANET,* 95; *RTAT,* 122; C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1984), 390-92, 454-56; also Young; de Boer, 37-47; Anderson. See also W. G. Lambert and A. R. Millard, *AtraḪasis* (Oxford, 1969), 98-99. → ניחוח *nîḥôaḥ.*

17. Rendtorff, *Studien,* 169-98; → מנחה *minḥâ.*

18. → רצה *rāṣâ.*

19. *BHS.*

III. Noun.

1. *Occurrences.* The noun *rêaḥ* occurs 58 times in the OT: 18 times in Numbers, 17 in Leviticus, 8 in the Song of Solomon, 4 each in Genesis, Exodus, and Ezekiel, once each in Jeremiah, Hosea, and Job. Of these occurrences, 43 are in the fixed expression *rêaḥ nîḥôaḥ,* "pleasing odor," found primarily in P and H. There is also one occurrence of the noun in Biblical Aramaic (Dnl. 3:27).

2. *Usage.* In the 15 instances where *rêaḥ* is not a *nomen regens* with *nîḥôaḥ,* it usually denotes a perceptible odor. It may be associated with a human being (e.g., "the smell of my son," *rêaḥ bᵉnî,* Gen. 27:27) or clothing (e.g., "the smell of his clothing," *rêaḥ bᵉgāḏāyw,* Gen. 27:27; "the scent of your garments," *rêaḥ śalmōṯayiḵ,* Cant. 4:11), or with the natural environment (e.g., "the smell of the field," *rêaḥ śāḏeh,* Gen. 27:27; "the fragrance of Lebanon," *rêaḥ lᵉḇānôn,* Hos. 14:7; Cant. 4:11; the fragrance put forth by blossoms on the vine, *wᵉhaggᵉpānîm sᵉmāḏar nāṯᵉnû rêaḥ,* Cant. 2:13;[20] the fragrance emitted by mandrakes, *haddûḏāʾîm nāṯᵉnû-rêaḥ,* 7:14[13];[21] the scent of apples, *tappûḥîm,* 7:9[8]; and even, remarkably, the "scent of water," *rêaḥ mayim,* Job 14:9). But the noun can also denote the aroma of extracts from aromatic plants such as nard (*nērd,* Cant. 1:12)[22] or the perfume of variously compounded oils (*šᵉmānîm,* 1:3; 4:10). Especially in the language of the Song of Songs, we often note a metaphorical use of the noun *rêaḥ* — e.g., the scent of the nose of the beloved is like that of apples (7:9[8]).

Occasionally *rêaḥ* denotes a foul odor. For example, the Israelite supervisors claim that Moses and Aaron "have brought us into bad odor *(hibʾaštem ʾeṯ-rêaḥ)* with Pharaoh and his officials" (Ex. 5:21); and, according to Jer. 48:11, the (foul) odor of Moab has never changed (*nāmār* [niphal of *mwr* I]).[23]

Finally, in the Aramaic sections of the book of Daniel we read that, thanks to the divine miracle, no "smell of fire" *(rêaḥ nûr)* came from the three men in the fiery furnace (Dnl. 3:27).

IV. LXX. The LXX translates the qal of *rwḥ* with *anapsýchein* (1 S. 16:23) or *anapaúesthai* (Job 32:20); for the hiphil it almost always uses *osphraínesthai.* By the same token, the noun *rêaḥ* is normally translated by *osmḗ* and the phrase *rêaḥ nîḥôaḥ* by *osmḗ euōdías.*

V. Dead Sea Scrolls. The laws in the Temple Scroll, which partially parallel P and H, use the expression "pleasing odor" *(ryḥ nyḥwḥ)* in its traditional sense as a technical cultic term, especially in connection with the festal cycle and its offerings (11QT 13:8ff.): the regular *(tāmîḏ)* sacrifice (13:12,15; cf. Ex. 29:38ff.; Nu. 28:3ff.), the sacrifices required at the beginning of the month (11QT 14:14,16; cf. Nu. 29:1ff.) and at the

20. *HAL,* III, 1226-27.
21. *HAL,* I, 216.
22. *HAL,* III, 1226.
23. *BLe,* §56u″; *HAL,* II, 560.

dedication festival (11QT 15:13; 16:10); also the prescribed sacrifices (20:8) and the sacrifices at the festival of the firstfruits of oil and the offering of wood (22:4,7; 23:17; 24:6); and finally the sacrifices on the first day of the seventh month (25:4,6; cf. Lev. 23:24; Nu. 29:1-6; Ezk. 45:18-21) and the Festival of Booths (11QT 28:2,6; cf. Lev. 23:33-36; Nu. 29:13-38; Ezk. 45:23-25). The expression also occurs once in the description of the temple courtyard (11QT 34:14). Of course these texts bear the stamp of the increased emphasis of the temple cult on purity, holiness, and above all atonement that is typical of postexilic Judaism.[24] The parallel tendency of ancient Judaism to reinterpret the sacrificial cult in a spiritualizing sense is illustrated by the use of the same expression in 1QS 8:9 (if the text has been transmitted correctly).[25]

Kronholm

---

24. →, respectively, טהר *ṭāhar;* קדשׁ *qdš;* כפר *kpr.* See, e.g., K. Koch, *EvT* 26 (1966) 217-39; → IX, 412-15, esp. 415; B. Z. Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran* (Cincinnati, 1983), esp. 9-13.

25. G. Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im NT. SUNT* 7 (1971), 62ff., 93ff.

רוּחַ *rûaḥ*

I. Etymology and Meaning. II. Ancient Near East: 1. West Semitic; 2. Akkadian and Sumerian; 3. Egyptian; 4. Israel. III. OT: 1. Occurrences; 2. Lexical Field. IV. Wind: 1. Natural Phenomenon; 2. God's Wind. V. Breath or Spirit: 1. Divine *rûaḥ* and Human Nature; 2. Human *rûaḥ;* 3. Charisma; 4. Eschatology. VI. LXX. VII. Later Literature: 1. Dead Sea Scrolls; 2. Other Literature. VIII. Gender.

---

rûaḥ. G. W. Ahlström, "I Samuel 1,15," *Bibl* 60 (1979) 254; R. Albertz and C. Westermann, "רוּחַ *rûᵃḥ* Geist," *THAT,* II, 726-53; D. C. Arichea, "Translating Breath and Spirit," *BT* 34 (1983) 209-13; J.-M. Asurmendi *et al.,* "L'Esprit-Saint dans la Bible," *Cahiers Évangile* 52 (1985); C. Bariko, *"dĕrĕk ruaḥ," BethM* 24 (1978/79) 309-14; F. Baumgärtel, "Spirit in the OT," *TDNT,* VI, 359-67; J. H. Becker, *Het begrip Nefesj in het OT* (Amsterdam, 1942); A. Benson, *Spirit of God in the Didactic Books of the OT* (Washington, 1949); G. Bettenzoli, *Geist der Heiligkeit. Quaderni di Semitistica* 8 (Florence, 1979); W. Beyerlin, "Das Königscharisma bei Saul," *ZAW* 73 (1961) 186-201; R. G. Bratcher, "Breath, Life and Spirit," *BT* 34 (1983) 201-9; C. A. Briggs, "The Use of רוח in the OT," *JBL* 19 (1900) 132-45; S. Castro, "Experiencia religiosa del Espíritu en la Biblia," *Revista de Espiritualidad* 42 (1983) 7-34; H. Cazelles, "L'Esprit de Dieu dans l'AT," in G. Lefebvre, ed., *Le mystère de l'Esprit Saint* (1968), 17-44; *idem,* "L'Esprit Saint dans l'AT," *Les Quatre Fleuves* 9 (1979) 5-22; *idem,* "Prolégomènes à une étude de l'Esprit dans le Bible," *Von Kanaan bis Kerala. FS J. P. M. van der Ploeg. AOAT* 211 (1982), 75-90; *idem et al.* "Saint Esprit I. AT et Judaïsme," *DBS* XI, 126-72, with bibliog.; Y. Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit* (Eng.

trans. New York, 1983); E. Dirscherl, *Der Heilige Geist und das menschliche Bewusstsein. Bonner dogmatische Studien* 4 (1989), esp. 155-63; H. Duhm, *Die bösen Geister im AT* (1904); T. Friedmann, *"ruaḥ 'elohim meraḥepet 'al penê ha-mayim," BethM* 25 (1979/80) 309-12; G. Gerleman, "Geist und Geistesgaben im AT," *RGG*[3], II, 1270-72; H. Goeke, "Das Menschenbild der individuellen Klagelieder" (diss., Bonn, 1971), esp. 208-9; M. Görg, "Religionsgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zur Rede vom 'Geist Gottes,'" *Wissenschaft und Weisheit* 43 (1980) 129-48; H. Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit* (Göttingen, [2]1921); *idem, The Influence of the Holy Spirit* (Eng. trans. Philadelphia, 1979); A. H. J. Gunneweg, "Aspekte des alttestamentlichen Geistverständnisses," *Loccumer Protokolle* 9 (1975) 1-12 = *idem, Sola Scriptura* (Göttingen, 1983), 96-106; R. D. Haak, "A Study and New Interpretation of *QṢR NPŠ*," *JBL* 101 (1982) 161-67; R. Hallevy, "Zu Charisma = Geist JHWSs," *BethM* 22 (1976/77) 266-67; V. Hamp, "Die zwei ersten Verse der Bibel," *FS H. Junker* (Trier, 1961), 113-26; E. Hanlotte, "L'Esprit de Yahweh dans l'AT," *FS H. de Lubac* I (Paris, 1963), 25-36; *idem,* "Profils de l'Esprit," *Cahiers Bibliques* 19 (1981) 5-31; J. Hehn, "Zum Problem des Geistes im Alten Orient und im AT," *ZAW* 43 (1925) 210-55; A. I. C. Heron, *The Holy Spirit* (Philadelphia, 1983); P. van Imschoot, "L'action de l'esprit de Jahvé dans l'AT," *RSPT* 23 (1934) 553-87; *idem,* "L'esprit de Jahvé et l'alliance nouvelle dans l'AT," *ETL* 13 (1936) 201-20; *idem,* "L'esprit de Jahvé, source de vie, dans l'AT," *RB* 44 (1935) 481-501; *idem,* "Sagesse et Esprit dans l'AT," *RB* 47 (1938) 23-49; M. E. Isaacs, *The Concept of Spirit. Heythrop Monographs* 1 (London, 1976); E. Jacob, "The Anthropology of the OT," *TDNT* IX, 617-31, esp. 628-30; A. Jepsen, *Nabi* (Munich, 1934), esp. 12-42; J. Jeremias, *Theophanie. WMANT* 10 ([2]1977); A. R. Johnson, *The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God* (Cardiff, [2]1961); *idem, The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel* (Cardiff, [2]1964); A. S. Kapelrud, "The Spirit and the Word in the Prophets," *ASTI* 11 (1977/78) 40-47; J.-L. Klein, "L'Esprit et l'Écriture," *ETR* 51 (1976) 149-63; R. Koch, *Geist und Messias* (Vienna, 1950); *idem,* "La portée anthropologique de la *Rûach* selon l'AT," *Studia Moralia* 19 (1981) 133-51; *idem,* "La théologie de l'Esprit de Yahvé dans le livre d'Isaie," in J. Coppens *et al.,* eds. *Sacra Pagina* 1. *BETL* (1959), 419-33; L. Köhler, *ThAT* ([4]1966), esp. 96-105; T. Kronholm, "Guds Ande i Gamla testamentet," *TTK* 55 (1984) 241-57; E. Kutsch, "'Ich will meinen Geist ausgiessen auf deine Kinder,'" *Das Wort, das weiterwirkt. FS K. Frör* (Munich, 1981), 122-133; R. S. Lauha, *Psychophysischer Sprachgebrauch im AT. AnAcScFen, diss. hum. litt.* 35 (1983); J. L. Lee, "The Spirit and the Unity of Change," *Encounter* 34 (1973) 147-61; H. Leene, *"Rûach* en *šᵉmû'â* in Jesaja 37,7," *Amsterdamse Cahiers voor exegese en bijbelse theologie* 4 (1983) 49-62, 134-35; F. Lindström, *God and the Origin of Evil. CBOT* 21 (1983), esp. 74-115; J. A. Loewen, "Clean Air or Bad Breath?" *BT* 34 (1983) 213-19; R. Luyster, "Wind and Water," *ZAW* 93 (1981) 1-10; D. Lys, *Rûach. Études d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 56 (1962); T. Maertens, "Der Geist des Herrn erfüllt den Erdkreis," *Die Welt der Bibel* 5 (1959) 7-115; *idem, The Spirit of God in Scripture* (Eng. trans. Baltimore, 1966); F. Manns, *Le symbole eau-esprit dans le judaïsme ancien. Studii biblici franciscani analecta* 19 (1983), esp. 65-97; T. N. D. Mettinger, *King and Messiah. CBOT* 8 (1976), esp. 233-53; S. Moscati, "The Wind in Biblical and Phoenician Cosmogony," *JBL* 66 (1947) 305-10; S. Mowinckel, "The 'Spirit' and the 'Word' in the Pre-Exilic Reforming Prophets," *JBL* 53 (1934) 199-227; 56 (1937) 261-65; G. Münderlein, *Kriterien wahrer und falscher Prophetie. EH* XXIII/33 ([2]1979), esp. 54-87; L. Neve, *The Spirit of God in the OT* (Tokyo, 1972); P. von der Osten-Sacken, "Geist im Buchstaben," *EvT* 41 (1981) 230-35; R. Penna, "Lo spirito di Cristo," *RivB Sup* 7 (1979), 93-116; E. Qimron, "Nomina ventorum caeli in fontibus nostris antiquis," *BethM* 25 (1979/80) 41-47; N. H. Ridderbos, "Gen. i 1 und 2," *OTS* 12 (1958) 214-60; H. Ringgren, "Hypostasen," *RGG*[3], III, 504-6; *idem, The Prophetical Conception of Holiness* (Lund, 1948); *idem, Word and Wisdom* (Lund, 1947); J. Scharbert, *Fleisch, Geist und Seele im Pentateuch. SBS* 19 (1966); *idem,* "Der 'Geist' und die Schriftpropheten," *Der Weg zum Menschen. FS A. Deissler* (1989), 82-97; J. H. Scheepers, *Die Gees van God en die Gees van die mens in die OT* (Kampen, 1960); O. Schilling, *Geist und Materie in biblischer Sicht. SBS* 25 (1967); H. H. Schmid, "Ekstatische und

I. Etymology and Meaning. The word *rûaḥ,* which is perhaps onomatopoetic,[1] may be considered a primitive noun based on a biliteral root.[2] The Hebrew word *rûaḥ,* however, presupposes a triliteral base *rwḥ* that evolved from this biliteral root; the

---

charismatische Geistwirkungen im AT," in C. Heitmann and H. Mühlen, eds., *Erfahrungen und Theologie des Heiligen Geistes* (Hamburg, 1974), 83-100; L. Schmidt, "König und Charisma im AT," *EvT* 24 (1964) 374-87; W. H. Schmidt, *Alttestamentlicher Glaube in seiner Geschichte* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, [6]1987), esp. 121-24; *idem,* "Anthropologische Begriffe im AT," *EvT* 24 (1964) 374-88; *idem,* "Geist/Heiliger Geist/Geistesgaben. I. AT," *TRE,* XII, 170-73; W. R. Schoemaker, "The Use of רוּחַ in the OT, and of πνεῦμα in the NT," *JBL* 23 (1904) 13-67; D.-D. Schunck, "Wesen und Wirken des Geistes nach dem AT," in P. Mäki, ed., *Taufe und Heiliger Geist. Schriften der Luther-Agricola-Gesellschaft* A18 (Helsinki, 1979), 7-30; *idem,* "Wesen und Wirksamkeit des Geistes nach der Überlieferung des ATs," in B. Schrage, ed., *Zur Theologie in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (1976), 11-23; E. Schweizer, *The Holy Spirit* (Eng. trans. Philadelphia, 1980); N. Shupak, "The 'Sitz im Leben' of the Book of Proverbs in the Light of a Comparison of Biblical and Egyptian Wisdom Literature," *RB* 94 (1987) 98-119, esp. 112-13; D. Silber, *"npš, nšmh wrwḥ," BethM* 16 (1970/71) 312-25; J. L. Ska, "Séparation des eaux et de la terre ferme dans le récit sacerdotal," *NRT* 103 (1981) 512-32, esp. 528-30; R. J. Sklba, "'Until the Spirit from on High Is Poured Out on Us' (Isa 32:15)," *CBQ* 46 (1984) 1-17; P. J. Smith, "A Semotactical Approach to the Meaning of the Term *rûaḥ 'ĕlōhîm* in Genesis 1:1," *JNSL* 8 (1980) 99-104; L. Stachowiak, "Duch," *Encyklopedia katolicka,* IV, 278-81; R. Vande Walle, "The Various Facets of Man in Wisdom Literature," *Jeevadhara* 16 (1986) 121-32; M. Vischer, "L'Esprit Saint," *ETR* 80 (1975) 225-29; P. Volz, *Der Geist Gottes und die verwandten Erscheinungen im AT und im anschliessenden Judentum* (1910); T. C. Vriezen, "De Heilige Geest in het OT," in *De Spiritu Sancto* (1964), 7-39; *idem,* "Ruach Jahweh (Elohim) in the OT," *Biblical Essays* (1966), 50-61; S. Wagner, "Geist und Leben nach Ezechiel 37,1-14," *ThV* 10 (1979) 53-65; Z. Weisman, "The Personal Spirit as Imparting Authority," *ZAW* 93 (1981) 225-34; C. Westermann, "Geist im AT," *EvT* 41 (1981) 223-30; *idem, Praise and Lament in the Psalms* (Eng. trans. Atlanta, 1981); M. Westphal, "Le ruach dans l'AT, son rôle et sa significance théologique" (diss., Geneva, 1958); W. Wifall, "The Breath of His Nostrils: Gen 2:7b," *CBQ* 36 (1974) 237-40; I. Willi-Plein, "Geist des Lebens," *Jud* 28 (1972) 91-110; J. K. Wiryamartana, "'Spirit' as a Symbol of Religious Experience in Jewish-Christian Tradition and Western Philosophy," *Orientasi* 6 (1974) 56-73; H.-W. Wolff, *Anthropology of the OT* (Eng. trans. Philadelphia, 1974), esp. 32-39; Wonsuk Ma, "The Spirit *(ruaḥ)* of God in Isaiah 1–39," *Asia Journal of Theology* 3 (1989) 582-96; L. J. Wood, *The Holy Spirit in the OT* (Grand Rapids, 1976); D. Zeller, "Geist," in A. Grabner-Haider, ed., *Die Bibel und unsere Sprache* (Vienna, 1970), 138-52; G. J. Zemek, "Aiming the Mind," *Grace Theological Journal* 5 (1984) 205-27.

On VII: A. A. Anderson, "The Use of *'Ruaḥ'* in 1QS, 1QH, and 1QM," *JSS* 7 (1962) 293-303; W. Foerster, "Der Heilige Geist im Spätjudentum," *NTS* 8 (1961/62) 117-34; H.-W. Kuhn, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil. SUNT* 4 (1966); F. Nötscher, *Geist und Geister in den Texten von Qumran. BBB* 17 (1962), 175-87; *idem,* "Heiligkeit in den Qumranschriften," *RevQ* 2 (1959/60) 163-81, 315-44, esp. 333-44; J. Pryke, "'Spirit' and 'Flesh' in the Qumran Documents and Some NT Texts," *RevQ* 5 (1964/65) 345-60; P. Schäfer, "Geist/Heiliger Geist/Geistesgaben. II. Judentum," *TRE,* XII, 173-78; *idem, Die Vorstellung vom Heiligen Geist in der rabbinischen Literatur. SANT* 38 (1972) (with bibliog.); J. Schreiner, "Geistbegabung in der Gemeinde von Qumran," *BZ* 9 (1965) 161-80; O. J. F. Seitz, "The Two Spirits of the Rule of the Community," *RevQ* 3 (1961/62) 449-52; P. Wernberg-Møller, "A Reconsideration of the Two Spirits in the Rule of the Community (1Q Serek III,13–IV,26)," *RevQ* 3 (1961/62) 413-41.

1. D. Winton Thomas, *ZS* 10 (1935) 311-14; Lys, 19-24.
2. *GK,* §30g,h,k.

same base is attested in Aramaic.[3] The form may be classified as a verbal noun modeled on the infinitive,[4] denoting an action: the "blowing" of the wind or "respiration." By analogy it came to mean "breathing" as a sign of life and hence "spirit" and "life."

From the same triliteral base probably come a few verbal forms along with their derived nouns:[5] *rwḥ* qal,[6] construed impersonally, "it becomes spacious (for someone)," "feel relieved,"[7] along with the hiphil *hērîaḥ,* "smell," and the noun *rêaḥ,* "odor, aroma." The qal and pual forms are assigned by *GesB* and *LexHebAram* to a separate root meaning "be spacious"; Lys, on the other hand, identifies only a single root, conveying a variety of meanings: "airy, spacious."[8] Cazelles, too, identifies a single root, but believes the basic meaning is "be spacious": *rûaḥ* denotes primarily the empty "air," only secondarily air in motion or "wind."[9] More likely, however, the spatial meaning found in Biblical Hebrew and other West Semitic languages arose through association with deep breathing and the resulting sense of expansiveness and relief. Akk. *napāšu* has a similar double meaning: "blow, breathe," as well as "expand."[10] The basic meaning "wind," something fleeting and ephemeral, leads logically to the figurative sense of "impermanence" and "futility."

II. Ancient Near East.

1. *West Semitic.* The base *rwḥ* appears throughout the entire range of West Semitic. In the Ugaritic texts it is always written *rḥ,* which can represent both Heb. *rûaḥ* and *rêaḥ.* In one text,[11] where the context speaks also of coriander, it should probably be translated "aroma." In another text,[12] in the instructions for Baal's descent into the netherworld, we read: "And you — take your clouds, your wind *(rḥk),* your lightning [?], your rain"; the context makes clear that *rḥ* is one of the meteorological phenomena associated with Baal-Hadad, the god of storms and tempests. These phenomena are also alluded by Baal's epithet *rkb ʿrpt,* "cloud rider"; cf. the OT theophanies that describe Yahweh as "riding" on the clouds or a "cherub," in parallel with soaring "upon the wings of the wind" *(ʿal-kanpê-rûaḥ):* Ps. 18:11[Eng. 10] par. 2 S. 22:11; Ps. 104:3. The Ugaritic expression has a literal parallel in Ps. 68:5(4), which calls Yahweh *rōḵēḇ bāʿarāḇôṯ* (cf. v. 34[33]; Dt. 33:26; Isa. 19:1). Yet another text describes Aqhat's death: *tṣi km rḥ npšh,* "his life shall depart like a breath";[13] the simile is continued by two parallel phrases: *km iṯl brlth* (two words of uncertain meaning)[14] and *km qṭr b ʾaph,* "like

3. See II.1 below.
4. *GK,* §83a.b.
5. *HAL,* III, 1197.
6. → רוח *rwḥ.*
7. *KBL*², 877: "be able to breathe."
8. P. 19; also *HAL,* III, 1196.
9. "Prolégomènes," 80ff.
10. *AHw,* II, 736-38; Johnson, *Vitality,* 7 n. 4; 23 n. 2; Scheepers, 94; Albertz and Westermann, 727.
11. *KTU,* 1.3, II, 2.
12. *KTU,* 1.5, V, 7.
13. *KTU,* 1.18, IV, 24-25; cf. 36-37.
14. *TO,* I, 439: "his vital principle like glair."

smoke from his nostrils"; these are clichés that appear in other texts. The expression in question is preceded immediately by a parallel expression denoting death: *špk km sỉy* [meaning uncertain][15] *dm* [elsewhere: *dmh*], "pour out (his) blood like a criminal [?]." The noun *rḥ* and its parallel *qṭr* are images representing the transitoriness of life. As in the OT, life seems to be associated with blood: when the blood is poured out, life *(npš)* departs through the nostrils *(ʾp)* like a breath *(rḥ)* or smoke *(qṭr).*

A Punic inscription for Carthage reads: "Whoever seeks to remove this stone . . . may Tinnit be judge over their *rḥ*."[16] Here *rḥ* should probably be understood simply as meaning "life" — in other words, Tinnit is to slay the offender. In Old Aramaic, stela III from Sefire[17] speaks of *rwḥ ʾpwh,* "breath of life," of a fugitive pleading for his life, i.e., seeking asylum.[18]

2. *Akkadian and Sumerian.* The base *rwḥ* is not found in the East Semitic languages, but the concepts associated with it have analogs in both Mesopotamia and Egypt. Among the Sumerians, Enlil, "lord of the air," is the god of the wind and the atmosphere. According to one myth, he separated the sky from the earth, thus performing the fundamental act in the creation of the world.[19] He is also the god of vegetation and of life, who brings forth abundance and prosperity; his "evil wind," contrariwise, is a destructive force, apparently totally random in its effects. The Lament over the Destruction of Ur[20] says of Enlil: "The winds of abundance he took away from the land, the good winds he took away from Sumer, the evil tempest he summoned";[21] it declares also that Enlil "hatefully sent forth" the tempest.[22]

In certain respects the equivalent of Heb. *rûaḥ* in Akkadian is *šāru,* "wind, storm, breath (of the god)," hence also "breath of life, blessing."[23] Thus the gods extol Marduk as *ili šāri ṭābi,* "the god of the good breath," and *i-na pu-uš-ki dan-ni ni-ṣi-nu šār-šu ṭa-a-bu,* "he whose good breath we inhale in terrible affliction."[24] The opposite of the "good wind" is the "evil wind" *(šāru limnu* or *imḫullu),* associated with seven demons who inflict catastrophes and illnesses. Marduk is by nature a god of storms and tempests, similar to the West Semitic Adad and possibly even of West Semitic origin. In the Creation Epic the winds (including *imḫullu*) are Marduk's weapons in his battle with Tiamat;[25] after assigning the gods their places and roles in his

---

15. *Ibid.,* 439: "Like a criminal."
16. *KAI,* 79.10-11.
17. *KAI,* 224.2.
18. See also *LexSyr,* 718-20; ContiRossini, 239; G. L. Harding, *An Index and Concordance of Preislamic Arabic Names and Inscriptions* (Toronto, 1971), 290 *(rwḥ); DISO* 275; P. Fronzaroli, *AANLR* 20 (1965), 139, 145; for Eblaite see M. Baldacci, *BiOr* 21 (1979) 73-77.
19. *RAO,* 69-70.
20. *SAHG,* 200; but cf. *RTAT,* 141.
21. Vv. 173-75.
22. V. 204.
23. Cf. Heb. *sāʿar, sᵉʿārâ.*
24. EnEl, VII, 23; for additional material see Hehn, 213-15.
25. EnEl, IV, 45.

cosmos, he retains for himself dominion over winds and meteorological phenomena.[26] Of particular importance is that in his battle Marduk makes the winds enter into Tiamat and cause her belly to swell; having killed her, he divides her in two, making one half the sky and the other the earth. Thus he plays the role of the god of the air, separating the earth from the sky, then taking his own place between the two as lord of the atmosphere. He shares this role of god of the air and winds with the Ugaritic Baal-Hadad, although Baal does not appear as creator of the world.

As synonyms of *šāru* we find *šēḫu* and *zāqīqu,* which can also have the meaning "omen, oracle," because the Babylonians thought of the winds as messengers of the gods. Hehn associates this conception with the ecstatic soothsayer called *maḫḫu,* roughly "raver," also called *šēḫānu:*[27] he is "one possessed by the *šēḫu,* the spirit, who in his holy madness sees visions and gives omens."[28]

Of central importance in Mesopotamia is the antithesis between the good and the evil wind, an expression of the capriciousness of the gods, who may either bless or afflict. Myths concerning the origin and constitution of humanity say nothing about a quickening divine exhalation or the breath of life or the spirit within an individual. Concerning Akkadian usage, Hehn observes accurately: "It is precisely in the sense of 'spirit' that *šāru* . . . lags behind *rûaḥ.*"[29] More generally, Mesopotamian mythology shows surprisingly little interest in human beings. When the Amarna Letters address the Egyptian king with the formula *šāri balāṭia,* "the breath of my life,"[30] they are echoing Egyptian usage (cf. Lam. 4:20, where the anointed king is called *rûaḥ 'appênû*).

3. *Egyptian.* In the Egyptian cosmology of Heliopolis, Shu is the god of the (dry) air and also the vital principle. Mythology describes him and his sister Tefnut (moisture) as being the first-begotten of Atum, the primal, universal god, or as being spat or exhaled from Atum's mouth. He is the primal wind and also carries out the first act of creation by separating the earth god Geb and his consort, the sky goddess Nut — like Sumerian Enlil and Babylonian Marduk, who also separate the sky from the earth. He is pictured as bearing up the goddess of the sky while standing upon the god of the earth; according to Derchain,[31] his name *šw* ("he who stands erect") alludes to this image. In the cosmos, therefore, he is identical with the space between the sky and the earth — not empty, but filled with life-giving air and light. Here he has dominion over the four winds.[32]

Amun, too, appears originally to have been a god of the air. As such, according to Sethe,[33] he was one of the eight primal gods of Hermopolis, before being transplanted

---

26. EnEl, V, 49-51.
27. E. F. Weidner, *AJSL* 38 (1921/22) 188.
28. Hehn, 224.
29. P. 213.
30. EA 141:2,6,10,13,37,43; 143:9,15,17; 144:2,6-8; 281:3.
31. P. Derchain, *Revue d'Égyptologie* 27 (1975) 110-16.
32. A. de Buck, *Plaats en betekenis van Sjoe in de Egyptische theologie* (Amsterdam, 1947); H. te Velde, *LexÄg,* V, 735-37; *RÄR,* 685-89.
33. K. Sethe, *Amun und die acht Urgötter von Hermopolis. Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 1929, Phil.-hist. Kl., no. 4.

to Thebes during the Eleventh Dynasty. In Thebes, identified with Re, he was worshiped as the sun god. In the cosmogony of Hermopolis, the eight primal gods produced the sun or light as the first principle of the cosmos. These primal gods, grouped in four pairs, represent precosmic chaos: the primal deep, infinite expanse, darkness — but also with Amun-Amaunet ("the hidden/invisible one"[34]), the wind, the invisible, dynamic principle from which the world originates, even before the sun. As god of the moving air, Amun is a spiritual being, omnipresent and quickening. It is true that this aspect of the god appears primarily in late texts. Sethe is convinced nevertheless that it conveys a picture of the original Amun. A hymn dating from the New Kingdom, found in the temple of Amun in the great oasis, extols Amun as the god of wind and weather: "You are Amun, you are Shu . . . , you are gloriously manifest in the four winds of the heavens, of which it is said: they issue from the mouth of His Majesty, the soul of Shu, who guides the wind to the sail of the sun-bark. . . . He enters into all trees, and they come alive in their swaying branches. . . . He brings tumult to the heavens and turmoil to the sea, and they grow calm when he grows calm. . . . His voice is heard but he is not seen. He makes all throats breathe; he strengthens the heart of the woman in childbirth and maintains the life of the child that comes forth from her — Amun, the soul of Shu, who enters into the clouds, separating the sky from the earth, who remains omnipresent in all aspects of human life."[35] This picture fits with the definition of Amun given by Eusebius: *tó diá pántōn chṓrōn pneúma,* "the breath that pervades all things."[36]

There is not a sharp dividing line between the god and the wind as a natural phenomenon; the vision is pantheistic. This pantheism is also clear in another hymn, in which Osiris is addressed as universal giver of life: "You blow air from your throat into the nostrils of human beings. How divine it is, this life-giving breath, stored up in your nostrils!"[37]

The king and all humanity receive life from the gods. This concept is illustrated by the many representations of a god holding the symbol of life (*ʿnḫ*) to the nostrils of the king. Chnum, the god of conception and birth (of both gods and mortals), forms the body of the child on his potter's wheel, which he brings with him into the womb to form the child. He places life in the nostrils and, with his female companion Heket, assists at the birth. He is called "sculptor who gives life." A dedicatory inscription at Abydos speaks of "Chnum, who formed human beings, who breathes air into all nostrils, who gives life to all the gods."[38]

Typically Egyptian is the pantheistic concept of a living harmonious universe into which the individual must fit in order to receive life. Air and wind are cosmic manifestations of life, the breath of the gods, which imparts life to human beings.[39]

---

34. *Ibid.,* 78, 87-90.
35. *Ibid.,* 97-98.
36. *Praep. ev.* 3.2.6.
37. *RAO,* 25.
38. Hehn, 217-18.
39. For further discussion see H. Brunner, *LexÄg,* I, 303-11; S. Morenz, *Gott und Mensch im alten Ägypten* (Leipzig, 1964); *RÄR,* 225-28.

4. *Israel.* This survey of Israel's neighbors raises the question of the distinctiveness of Israel and the OT. Here we shall note only the anthropocentricity of Israel's understanding of God and the world, which manifests itself not only in an anthropomorphic conceptuality (a feature found throughout most of the ancient Near East) but also in a powerful awareness of human subjectivity in relation to the natural world and God: human beings have dominion over the world and all living things (Gen. 1; Ps. 8). The Yahwist's primal history does not even mention the creation of the world, describing only the origin of humanity within an anthropocentric world (Gen. 2). Consistent with this anthropocentrism is Israel's markedly ethnocentric understanding of itself in the midst of the gentile world. The people consider themselves to be the object of their God's special election, but also to be a collective subject ethically responsible to God and the natural world. In like fashion, Israel thinks of God as an extramundane subject in relation to the world, humanity, and Israel — on which, however, he looks with personal favor. The OT has very little to say about the actual nature of God.

The distinction and separation of these subjects in their relationship to one another and to the world fits with an understanding of the living person as "a unit of vital power,"[40] manifesting itself through its activity above and beyond the corporeal limits of the body. This activity is conceived as an "extension of the personality"; its force field is the locus of the *rûaḥ*. Here the thought of the OT would differ from the pantheistic ideas of Egyptian religion and Mesopotamian mythology. The latter deals with a self-contained world of gods and their relationships; only rarely do they address themselves to human beings, who live and serve the gods on the margin of their world. "The gods took control of life for themselves";[41] only the gods, not humans, breathe the "good breath" of Marduk.[42] Neither extramundane existence nor concern for humankind characterizes the Mesopotamian concept of the gods.

III. OT.

1. *Occurrences.* The word *rûaḥ* occurs 378 times in the OT plus 11 times in the Aramaic portions of Daniel. It is usually feminine, but occasionally masculine. There are 38 occurrences in the Pentateuch, but none in Leviticus and only 2 in Deuteronomy; it is rare in legal material. Of fundamental importance are the 7 occurrences in the primeval history. Assignment of particular texts to J, E, or P is often uncertain. There are 47 occurrences of *rûaḥ* in the Former Prophets. It is especially frequent in the earlier historical narratives: 26 occurrences in Judges — 1 Samuel, plus 9 in the Elijah-Elisha cycle and 4 in 1 K. 22 (3 in poetic texts). The Dtr redaction sees a special association of Yahweh's *rûaḥ* with the leaders and prophets of the early period.

It is noteworthy that the 8th-century prophets and Jeremiah almost never appeal to Yahweh's *rûaḥ*;[43] in fact, the word is uncommon in all the prophetic writings. In Amos it appears only in 4:13 (secondary), in a hymnic section describing Yahweh as creator

40. Johnson, *Vitality,* 2, 19.
41. Gilg., X, 5.
42. EnEl; see above.
43. Volz, 62-69; van Imschoot, "L'action," 570-71; Jepsen, 24-27.

of the wind. It occurs 7 times in Hosea, 3 times in the sense of a devastating "wind" or "worthlessness." In 9:7 "the prophet" *(hannāḇî')* is referred to (probably scornfully) as "the man of the spirit" *('îš hārûaḥ)*. Of the 28 occurrences in Isaiah 1–39, the majority are probably late (probably including 11:1-4, which uses *rûaḥ* 5 times for the spirit given to the coming Davidic king). Only in Mic. 3:8 does the prophet describe himself as being "filled" with Yahweh's *rûaḥ;* the authenticity of this passage, however, is uncertain. The word occurs twice more in Micah.

In Jeremiah, too, the word does not appear often with the meaning "breath, spirit, life"; several of its 18 occurrences speak of the "wind" as an instrument of Yahweh's judgment or think of *rûaḥ* as "worthlessness." Not until the prophets of the exilic and postexilic period does *rûaḥ* become once more a word of theological significance. The book of Ezekiel, with 52 occurrences, occupies a central position in this respect.[44] There are 23 occurrences in Isa. 40–66, 2 in Jonah, 2 in Habakkuk, 4 in Haggai, and 12 in Zechariah and Malachi. Here we should single out the theologically important statement concerning the outpouring of the spirit at the eschaton in Joel 3:1-2(2:28-29), where the word occurs twice — the only occurrences in the book of Joel.

Poetry and wisdom literature — as one would expect — use the word *rûaḥ* frequently and in various senses. It occurs 39 times in Psalms, 31 times in Job, 21 times in Proverbs, and 24 times in Ecclesiastes (9 times par. *heḇel,* "vanity").

In contrast to the Dtr History, it is typical of the Chronicler to ascribe prophetic speech to the *rûaḥ* of God or Yahweh (1 Ch. 12:19[18]; 2 Ch. 20:14; 24:20 [twice in the expression *rûaḥ lāḇᵉšâ,* "the spirit clothed," said elsewhere only of Gideon [Jgs. 6:34]) and to describe Yahweh as "stirring up" (*'wr* hiphil) the spirit of foreign kings and nations (1 Ch. 5:26; 2 Ch. 21:16; 36:22 par. Ezr. 1:1; elsewhere only in Jer. 51:11 and similarly 2 K. 19:7 par. Isa. 37:7; also of those returning from exile [Ezr. 1:5; similarly Hag. 1:14]).

The word does not occur in Obadiah, Nahum, Zephaniah, Ruth, Song of Songs, Esther, and Leviticus.

2. *Lexical Field.* This survey reveals the varying usage of the word in different types of text and in different periods. It is impossible, however, to categorize and systematize this usage; therefore Lys's analysis on the basis of literary types yields little. Neither, despite many attempts, is it possible to demonstrate a semantic development, because the evidence is too limited and the chronology of the texts too uncertain. The distinction between the meanings "wind" and "breath, spirit, life" divides the texts into two primary groups: according to Scheepers, the meaning "wind" is present in 144 texts; of course this number is only approximate, since often enough the meaning is uncertain — e.g., in the phrase *rûaḥ ᵉlōhîm/yhwh,* where it would be possible to think at least figuratively of the wind as Yahweh's breath (cf. Ps. 18:16[15]).[45] Furthermore, it is not always possible

44. Lys, 121-46; W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 42; *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 261-63.

45. Scheepers, 11. Lys, 152, finds 113; Briggs, 133, finds 117.

to draw a clear line between the meanings "spirit" and "wind," as in Ezk. 37:9, where "the four winds" are called upon to restore the dead bones to life (cf. John 3:8).

a. *Wind.* Besides *rûaḥ,* the semantic field "wind" includes *sa'ar/śa'ar/sᵉ'ārâ* (cf. Akk. *šāru*) and *sûpâ;* the former occur a total of 25 times, the latter 15 times, often in theophanies (e.g., Isa. 29:6). Unlike these words, *rûaḥ* does not inherently mean a violent wind;[46] in Hos. 8:7 *sûpâ* following *rûaḥ* denotes an intensification from "wind" to "whirlwind." The phrase *rûaḥ sᵉ'ārâ* (Ezk. 1:4; Ps. 107:25; 148:8) or *rûaḥ sᵉ'ārôṯ* (Ezk. 13:11,13), "stormy wind," is a distinctive qualification, which can also be expressed adjectivally: *rûaḥ gᵉḏôlâ* (Jon. 1:4; Job 1:19), *rûaḥ qāšâ* (Isa. 27:8), *rûaḥ ḥāzāq* (Ex. 10:19), *rûaḥ 'azzâ* (Ex. 14:21); or adverbially: *rûaḥ mālē'* (Jer. 4:12). The → סופה *sûpâ* is a destructive wind; the *sᵉ'ārâ* also brings destruction, as can *rûaḥ* itself (Isa. 17:13). Through the storm or whirlwind Yahweh manifests his anger and executes his judgment (Jer. 23:19-20; 30:23-24).

In the book of Job the *sᵉ'ārâ* performs a different function when God answers Job "out of the whirlwind" (38:1; 40:6). The language is borrowed from the ancient theophanies, but God's self-manifestation in the whirlwind satisfies Job's own demand to stand before God (19:25ff.; 23:3ff.) and leads Job to wisdom and understanding (28:20-23; 42:3-5). Here already we are moving toward the function of Yahweh's *rûaḥ,* "spirit."

In conjunction with *rûaḥ* we also find → הבל *heḇel,* "breath," "worthlessness" (66 times: 32 in Ecclesiastes, 8 in Jeremiah, only 3 in the Dtr History, among which 2 K. 17:15 is probably borrowed from Jer. 2:5). This meaning seems to be far removed from the tempestuous whirlwind. When Isa. 57:13 says of idols that "the wind *(rûaḥ)* will carry them off, a breath *(heḇel)* will take them away," the image is probably that of a violent or devastating wind. Elsewhere, however, the idols themselves are called *heḇel,* because they are impotent and powerless (cf. Jer. 14:22): those who trust in their "worthlessness" will never receive help (Jer. 2:5 par. 2 K. 17:15).

But *rûaḥ* itself can also stand for the worthlessness of idols (Isa. 41:29, "their works are nothing, their images are empty wind"). Human beings similarly are "worthlessness" because they are treacherous (Ps. 62:10[9]). Deceit and lies are also called *rûaḥ,* e.g., the words of the false prophets (Mic. 2:11). False prophets themselves can be called *rûaḥ* (Jer. 5:13); empty or misleading knowledge and speech are called *da'aṯ-rûaḥ* (Job 15:2) and *diḇrê-rûaḥ* (Job 16:3). In Ecclesiastes life on earth and all human efforts are considered "vanity," often denoted by the parallelism *heḇel ûrᵉ'ûṯ rûaḥ* (1:14, etc.) or *ra'yôn rûaḥ,* "vanity and chasing after wind" (1:17; 4:16).

The root → רעה *rā'â,* "pasture," "intend," possibly "pursue," also appears elsewhere in conjunction with *rûaḥ:* "Ephraim pursues the wind and chases after the east wind" (Hos. 12:2[1]; cf. Jer. 22:22).

In these texts *rûaḥ* and *heḇel* in the sense of "wind" or "breath" stand figuratively for "worthlessness" or "vanity," probably because the wind itself is fickle and vanishes without a trace (cf. Eccl. 11:5). At the same time anything insubstantial, unsta-

46. Contra N. H. Snaith, *The Distinctive Ideas of the OT* (Philadelphia, 1944), 145-46.

ble, or deceptive is carried off by the wind and hence resembles the wind. This notion leads to the image of Yahweh's judgment as the wind that blows away the chaff during threshing and winnowing: the wicked are like the "chaff that the wind drives away" (Ps. 1:4).

Ecclesiastes also uses the notion of the wind in a different sense: "Round and round goes the wind, and on its circuits the wind returns" (1:6), an image of life's futility. On the other hand, human beings have no control over the wind — no more can they evade death or change their destinies (8:8). In the context of statements concerning the transitoriness of human life, *rûaḥ* and *heḇel* have more the sense of (fleeting) breath (Ps. 39:6,12[5,11]; 78:39; 144:4; Job 7:16; [cf. v. 7, *rûaḥ ḥayyāy,* "my life is wind"[47]]; Isa. 2:22 [*n*ᵉ*šāmâ*]).

b. *Breath.* In addition to *rûaḥ,* the semantic field "breath/spirit/life" includes → חיה *ḥāyâ,* "live," with the noun *ḥayyîm,* "life." Like this word, *rûaḥ* can also denote physical vitality (Gen. 45:27; Jgs. 15:19; 1 S. 30:12; 1 K. 21:5). The "breath of life," which distinguishes what is living from what is not, P calls *rûaḥ ḥayyîm* in Gen. 6:17 (humans and animals) and 7:22 (animals). Idols do not have *rûaḥ* (Jer. 10:14; 51:17), nor do dead bones (Ezk. 37:8). The noun does not, however, denote life that is ethically valorized and blessed (*dereḵ haḥayyîm,* "the way of life" in contrast to "the way of death," Jer. 21:8; cf. Prov. 6:23; *ḥayyîm,* "life span," Gen. 3:17; 23:1; Dt. 4:9; etc.). Just as Yahweh "brings to life" (*ḥyh* piel/hiphil), so too he gives *rûaḥ,* a power emanating from him that vivifies or enables the recipient to perform a particular task. But *rûaḥ* does not stand for Yahweh's own, inward life (but cf. Isa. 30:1; 40:13; Mic. 2:7, in which Yahweh's *rûaḥ* is more or less synonymous with "heart" or "mind").[48]

The noun → נפש *nep̱eš* shares with *rûaḥ* the meanings "life" and "breath." In the majority of texts, however, *rûaḥ* is associated with Yahweh, whereas such an association is relatively rare in the case of *nep̱eš.*[49] We also find *nep̱eš* used for a "living being" (Gen. 2:7) or person; *rûaḥ* hardly ever appears in this concrete sense. When *nep̱eš* stands in parallel with *rûaḥ,* both words should be understood in the sense of "soul," "mind," or "life," e.g., Isa. 26:9: "My soul yearns for you in the night, my spirit within me earnestly seeks you." Schmidt thinks otherwise: "Just as 'soul' can function as a personal or relative pronoun, so 'spirit' and 'heart' used in parallelism can be equated with a personal pronoun: 'Into your hand I commend my *spirit,* for you redeem *me,* Yahweh the faithful God' (Ps. 31:6)."[50] But it is not necessary for the elements of a parallel construction to be synonymous. Whereas the word *nep̱eš* can denote the whole person, *rûaḥ* is always said to be "within" (*b*ᵉ*qereḇ*) someone (Isa. 19:3,14; 26:9; 63:11; Ezk. 11:19 = 36:26-27; Hos. 5:4; Hab. 2:19; Zec. 12:1; Ps. 51:12[10]). Like the "heart," *rûaḥ* denotes a person's "interior," the spiritual center from which the entire person is engaged. In the texts cited, *rûaḥ* and *nep̱eš* denote the vital principle, depen-

47. Briggs, 135.
48. See below for further discussion.
49. Lys, 336, calls *rûaḥ* a "theo-anthropological term"; also Wolff, 32.
50. "Anthropologische Begriffe," 386.

dent on God for renewal and preservation. Therefore *rûaḥ* and *nepeš* trust in God and yearn for God. Of Ps. 51:19(17) Schmidt says: "If 'a broken spirit and a shattered heart' are the acceptable sacrifice, the psalmist is offering 'himself as a sacrifice.'"[51] But the text goes on to speak of humble contrition!

Used in the sense of "throat," the organ used to swallow, *nepeš* can denote desire or longing: hunger and thirst (Dt. 12:15,21ff.; 1 S. 2:16; Ps. 107:9; Prov. 6:30), the greed of enemies (Ps. 27:12; 41:3[2]), thirsting for God (63:2[1]; 84:3[2]; 143:6). The OT also uses *rûaḥ* for passionate desire and excitement, but primarily in association with aggressiveness and action, such as anger;[52] as noted above, only exceptionally does the *rûaḥ* "thirst."

Other organs, too, can appear parallel with *rûaḥ* as the seat of emotion: *'ap̱/'appayim,*[53] "nose, nostrils," denotes anger, which is expressed by "snorting" (Job 4:9, *rûaḥ 'appô,* "the breath of his anger"). Like God's *rûaḥ,* God's face[54] can manifest anger or favor (Ps. 104:29; 139:7).

Also important is the mouth[55] as the organ of speech; a command or word of authority is the "breath of the mouth" (Job 8:2, ironically), as are Yahweh's creative word and the king's word of judgment (Isa. 11:4). Hehn discusses at more length the "breath of the mouth" as the efficacious and vivifying word of the deity and the king in the ancient Near East, especially Egypt; he also discusses the relationship of the *rûaḥ ᵉlōhîm* to God's creative word in Gen. 1:2-3 from this perspective.[56]

Also deserving of mention is the hand[57] as the instrument of divine and human activity. The laying on of hands transmits *rûaḥ* (Dt. 34:9). When the hand of Yahweh is upon someone, the effect of the *rûaḥ* is manifest: prophetic speech (2 K. 3:15) and ecstatic vision (Ezk. 1:3; 37:1; 40:1; etc.). In parallel with "You open your hand" in Ps. 104:28, v. 30 says, "You send forth your *rûaḥ*."[58]

The most common anthropological term is "heart."[59] Like *rûaḥ, lēḇ* can denote simply corporeal vitality; but, as the central organ of the body, the heart is above all the seat of the intellect, the will, and the emotions, as well as of abilities and virtues. By metonymy it denotes the sometimes hidden thoughts, intentions, and decisions of a person (Isa. 29:13; Ps. 28:3; Job 10:13; Prov. 25:3). The human heart often stands in contrast to hypocritical speech and actions: God sees the heart (Jer. 20:12), knows it (1 K. 8:39; Ps. 33:15; Prov. 15:11), searches it (Jer. 17:10; Ps. 139:23), tests it (Jer. 11:20; 12:3; Ps. 7:10; 17:3), or weighs it (Prov. 21:2; 24:12). In such contexts *rûaḥ* can also be used: as well as the heart, Yahweh weighs the spirit (Prov. 16:2), knows the

51. "Anthropologische Begriffe," 386.
52. See V.2 below.
53. → אנף *'ānaph.*
54. → פנים *pānîm.*
55. → פה *peh;* → לשון *lāšôn;* → שׂפה *śāpâ (śᵉpāṯayim).*
56. Hehn, 218-21. See IV.2.d below.
57. → יד *yāḏ.*
58. For further discussion see P. Dhorme, *RB* 29 (1920) 482ff.
59. → לבב/לב *lēḇ/lēḇāḇ.*

things that have entered the spirit (Ezk. 11:5; similarly 20:32; cf. *lēb* in Isa. 65:17; Jer. 3:16; 7:31 = 19:5; 32:35; 44:21).

Not rarely we also find *rûaḥ* used in the sense of "mind," parallel or synonymous with "heart" (Nu. 14:24; Dt. 2:30; Isa. 26:9; 29:24; Ezk. 13:3; Mal. 2:15-16; Ps. 32:2; 77:7[6]; 106:33; 142:4[3]; 143:4 [par. *lēḇ*]; Job 21:4; 32:18; Eccl. 7:9); this usage can include God's own "mind" or hidden thoughts (cf. Isa. 40:13: "Who can weigh the mind of Yahweh?" — if this does not refer to Yahweh's creative power; exceptionally, the LXX translates *rûaḥ* here with *noús*). Only rarely does the OT speak elsewhere of Yahweh's *rûaḥ* in the sense of "mind" or "attitude" (Mic. 2:7; Isa. 30:1). The latter text speaks of an alliance with Egypt that is against Yahweh's *rûaḥ;* the parallel in v. 2, "they have not consulted my mouth," has led many to consider this text evidence for prophetic proclamation inspired by Yahweh's "spirit," an idea scarcely found elsewhere in preexilic prophecy; both here and in 40:13, however, *rûaḥ* parallels *'ēṣâ:* the alliance is simply contrary to Yahweh's "will" or "intent."[60]

According to Briggs,[61] the use of *rûaḥ* to denote the seat of psychic activity is rare and late. But there are not a few passages — and not all of them late — in which *rûaḥ* is synonymous with "heart" (see above), and the much commoner use of the word in parallel with *lēḇ* to denote abilities, moral virtues, acts of will, and emotions is not essentially different. Both *rûaḥ* and *lēḇ* are modified by the same adjectives: *nišbār(â),* "broken" (Ps. 51:19[17], text uncertain; cf. 34:19[18]); *ṭāhôr/nāḵôn,* "pure/steadfast" (51:12[10]; cf. 57:8[7] = 108:2[1]; 78:37; 112:7); *ḥāḏāš/ḥ^a^ḏāšâ,* "new" (Ezk. 36:26). Without any adjective, *rûaḥ* and *lēḇ* are used synonymously in the sense of "courage" (Josh. 2:11; cf. 5:1; Ezk. 21:12). Construct phrases can denote moral dispositions and emotions: *gōḇah rûaḥ,* "arrogance" (Prov. 16:18); *šeḇer rûaḥ,* "anguish of spirit" (Isa. 65:14; cf. Prov. 15:4); they can also be used to characterize a person: *g^e^ḇah-lēḇ,* "one who is arrogant" (Prov. 16:5); also *g^e^ḇah-rûaḥ* (Eccl. 7:8).

The fundamental semantic difference between *rûaḥ* and *lēḇ* is illustrated best by their differing relationship with wisdom. The heart is the seat of wisdom and understanding (Ex. 31:6; 1 K. 3:12; Job 9:4; Prov. 2:10; 14:33; 16:21). Never is *rûaḥ* so described: it appears only in the phrase *rûaḥ ḥoḵmâ,* "spirit of wisdom," in the sense of "skill" or "virtue of wisdom" (Ex. 28:3; Dt. 34:9; Isa. 11:2). In the OT, however, wisdom is always God's gift: Joseph is a wise and understanding man because "the spirit of God is in him" (Gen. 41:38). Yahweh "fills" people with the "spirit of wisdom" (Ex. 28:3; Dt. 34:9); he "gives" a wise and understanding heart (1 K. 3:12). What is instilled by God is called *rûaḥ,* whereas what issues directly from the person comes from the "heart" (Nu. 16:28 [P?]; 24:13; 1 K. 12:33; Jer. 23:16; Ezk. 13:2 [but cf. v. 3, in parallel with *rûaḥ,* though the text is uncertain]).

The relatively rare word → נשמה *n^e^šāmâ* is generally synonymous with *rûaḥ*. Like the latter, it can mean "wind," but only figuratively in the sense of "God's breath" (Ps. 18:16[15] = Isa. 30:33; Job 4:9; 37:10). Albertz and Westermann define the difference

---

60. Jepsen, 16.
61. Briggs, 139.

between the two words as follows: *rûaḥ* is "the particular process of breathing in which the dynamic vitality of the human being is expressed," whereas *nᵉšāmâ* is "the breath that distinguishes the living from the dead . . . , thus a given creaturely fundamental reality with a more constant character."[62] They also assume semantic development coupled with a shift in usage: "The old word for creaturely breath, the constitutive element of human life, was *nᵉšāmâ;* God breathed it into humanity at creation (Gen. 2:7)."[63] Only later did *rûaḥ* also take on the sense of "breath of life," so that P could use it in the context of the creation narrative. But, they claim, that *rûaḥ* never replaced "the old usage employing *nᵉšāmâ*" is illustrated by a number of passages (esp. in Job) that use the two words in parallel. Now the only passage they mention (Gen. 2:7) does not support any conclusions about an earlier "usage," and the assumption that J is unacquainted with the word *rûaḥ* is based on a literary source analysis that itself uses the occurrence of the word *rûaḥ* as an a priori criterion for identifying P.

It is almost impossible to trace a semantic development of *rûaḥ* within the OT, nor is the book of Job in itself a witness to the later survival of earlier usage. It is more accurate to say that *nᵉšāmâ* is a highly poetic word that was a favorite of the author. The example of Job 34:14-15 makes this clear: "If he [God] were to take back his spirit *(rûḥô)* and his breath *(nišmāṯô)* . . ."; this passage was likely modeled on Ps. 104:29, but added the parallel and synonymous expression *nišmāṯô.* In J's primal history *nᵉšāmâ* appears in Gen. 2:7 and 7:22 (?), whereas P uses *rûaḥ* in the phrase *rûaḥ ḥayyîm,* "breath of life" (6:17; 7:15), corresponding to J's expression.

Now it is possible that *rûaḥ* also occurs in the J material (Gen. 6:3; 7:22); but scholars often reject the assignment of these verses to J, possibly on insufficient grounds. In the case of 7:22, exegetes generally assume that the double expression *nišmaṯ-rûaḥ ḥayyîm* is a redactional blend of *nišmaṯ ḥayyîm* (Gen. 2:7 [J]) and *rûaḥ ḥayyîm* (6:17; 7:15 [P]). There is, however, a possible occurrence of an analogous double expression in an early text (Ps. 18:16[15] par. 2 S. 22:16), where *nišmaṯ rûaḥ 'appô* refers to Yahweh's anger. On the other hand, the expression *nišmaṯ ḥayyîm* does not refer primarily to "creaturely breath, the constitutive element of human life," but to the life-giving breath emanating from Yahweh; the directive verb in Gen. 2:7 says that Yahweh breathed the breath of life "into the nostrils" of man (cf. "my spirit" in the words spoken by Yahweh in 6:3 and the expression *nišmaṯ šadday tᵉḥayyēnî,* "the breath of Shaddai gives me life," in Job 33:4). Gen. 7:22, by contrast, recounts the death of all living creatures, humans and animals *(kōl 'ašer nišmaṯ-rûaḥ ḥayyîm bᵉ'appāyw);* the relative clause here, a noun clause, describes a state: the breath of life is "in the nose," and life is conceived of as an immanent possession. This distinction is not signaled by the meaning of the particular words but by the larger unit of the clause.

In short, *nᵉšāmâ* and *rûaḥ* are virtually synonymous except in texts where the former serves as a collective term (Dt. 20:16; Josh. 10:40; 11:11,14; 1 K. 15:29; Ps. 150:6). We never find *rûaḥ* used with this meaning. Semantically similar is the expres-

62. *THAT,* II, 735.
63. *Ibid.,* 736.

sion *yhwh ʾᵉlōhê hārûḥōṯ lᵉḵol-bāśār,* "Yahweh, the God of the breath of life in all flesh" (Nu. 16:22; 27:16 [P]; cf. Job 12:10), where *rûaḥ* denotes simply the vital principle of each person.

The word *rûaḥ* never stands for the "living" collectively, nor for the person as a whole. Linguistically and conceptually, therefore, the ancient Israelites were in a position to differentiate between individual persons and their constituent elements, as well as between the inward spiritual core of a person and the various outward manifestations of that person's life. A person's spirit or life, accordingly, could be seen as something transcending corporeality. In its consistent view that *rûaḥ* is God's special gift, the OT refers to this transcendent character. We may conclude that it would be wrong to overemphasize the "synthetic" thought or the "monism" of the OT.[64]

c. *Antonyms.* The noun → עפר *ʿāp̱ār,* "dust, earth," can serve as an antonym to *rûaḥ* when the text emphasizes the transitoriness of life: without the *rûaḥ* that comes from God, human beings return to dust (Ps. 104:29; cf. Gen. 3:19; Ps. 103:14; Job 10:9; 34:14-15). Another antonym of *rûaḥ* is → בָּשָׂר *bāśār,* "flesh, body," or "corporeal being," especially when the text emphasizes human weakness and impotence in contrast to God's mighty *rûaḥ* (par. only in Ps. 78:39). According to Isa. 31:3, "the Egyptians are human, and not God; their horses are *bāśār* and not *rûaḥ.*" Human frailty in this sense is not considered negative by the OT: recognition of the human situation is the realistic prerequisite for obedience and trust in God. According to Ezk. 11:19, Yahweh will put a "new spirit" *(rûaḥ ḥᵃḏāšâ)* within the people. The parallel in the second hemistich says, "I will give them a heart of flesh." In contrast to a "heart of stone," this text speaks of both a "new spirit" and, by way of explanation, a *lēḇ bāśār,* a positive image of obedience (cf. v. 20). Zec. 4:6 uses different language to describe the contrast between human weakness and God's power: "Not by human might, not by power, but by my spirit." The words of Yahweh in Joel 3:1(2:28) are to be understood as the eschatological hope for a new, life-giving spirit: "I will pour out my spirit on all flesh."

IV. Wind.

1. *Natural Phenomenon.* With the meaning "wind," *rûaḥ* is the subject of several verbs of motion. We frequently find *bôʾ,* "come" (Jer. 4:12; Ezk. 1:4; Hos. 13:15; Job 1:19; 41:8[16]); *hālaḵ,* "go" (Ezk. 1:12,20; Eccl. 1:6; also hithpael, Zec. 6:7); *ʿāḇar* and *ḥālap̱,* "pass by" (1 K. 19:11; Hab. 1:11; Ps. 103:16; Job 4:15; 37:21); other verbs are less common: *rāḥap̱,* "hover, move (?)" (Gen. 1:2; describing an eagle's wings, Dt. 32:11); *nāsaʿ,* "go forth" (Nu. 11:31); *nāšaḇ,* "blow" (Isa. 40:7); *bāqaʿ,* "break out" (Ezk. 13:11); *sāḇaḇ* and *šûḇ,* "go around" and "return" (Eccl. 1:6); *yāṣāʾ,* "go out" (Zec. 6:5ff., describing the four winds). The wind is perceived as invisible movement and force. Various transitive verbs describe its effect: *nāśāʾ,* "bring, carry away" (Ex. 10:13,19 [locusts]; 1 K. 18:12 and 2 K. 2:16 [the prophet Elijah]; Isa. 41:16 [chaff]; 57:13 [idols]); *rwm* piel, "lift up" (Ps. 107:25 [waves]); *ʿāśâ,* "fulfill" (Ps. 148:8

64. Johnson, *Vitality,* 1ff.

[Yahweh's command]); *nāḡaʿ bᵉ*, "touch" (Ezk. 17:10 [the east wind causing the vine to wither]); *yāḇēš* hiphil, "dry up" (Ezk. 19:12); *šāḇar* and *prq* piel, "shatter" (1 K. 19:11 [mountains and rocks]; Ps. 48:8[7] [ships]; cf. Ezk. 27:26); *rdp* pual, "chase" (Isa. 17:13); and *nāḏap*, "drive away" (Ps. 1:4 [chaff]). These effects are mostly violent and baneful. Particularly vivid is the image of winnowing, during which the wind blows away the chaff.

The concrete notions associated with the wind are due in part to the climatic conditions of Palestine, dominated by the refreshing west wind that rises from the sea and brings rain. Strangely enough, the OT rarely mentions this wind; but where it does appear, it is beneficent: the west wind drives away the locusts (Ex. 10:19) and brings quails in the desert (Nu. 11:31). At the end of a great drought, Elijah's servant looks out over the sea from the top of Carmel, and "the heavens grew black with clouds and wind, and there was a torrential rain" (1 K. 18:45).

Most often, the text speaks of the east wind, *rûaḥ (haq)qāḏîm* (Ex. 10:13; 14:21; Jer. 18:17; Ezk. 17:10; 19:12; 27:26; Jon. 4:8; Ps. 48:8[7] [text uncertain]; cf. Gen. 41:6,23,27; Isa. 27:8; Hos. 12:2[1]; 13:15; Ps. 78:26; Job 15:2; 27:21; 38:24), also *rûaḥ hammiḏbār*, "desert wind" (Jer. 13:24; cf. 4:11; Hos. 13:15; Job 1:19). This expression refers to the sirocco, which appears in the spring and fall, withering the spring vegetation and inflicting damage by its violence (Ps. 48:8[7]; Job 1:19; 27:21). It is associated particularly with the transiency of life (Isa. 40:7; Ps. 103:15-16; Ezk. 17:10; 19:12) and Yahweh's judgment (Isa. 27:8; Jer. 13:24; 18:17; Ezk. 27:26; Hos. 13:15), but it is also the dry offshore wind that drives back the sea and turns it into dry land (Ex. 14:21, here linked exceptionally with the motif of Yahweh's battle with chaos). The various meteorological phenomena in theophanies are not associated with any particular point of the compass.

The north and south winds are scarcely associated with concrete phenomena. Prov. 25:23 states that the north wind *(rûaḥ ṣāpôn)* brings rain, but this is hardly typical of Palestine. Ps. 78:26(25) connects the south wind *(têmān)* with the desert period. The north and south wind together serve as a metaphor for sexual arousal (Cant. 4:16).

The various expressions for "the four winds" (Jer. 49:36; Ezk. 37:9; 42:20; 1 Ch. 9:24; cf. Zec. 2:10(6); 6:5; Dnl. 8:8; 11:4; also 7:2 [Aramaic]) reflect the notion of cosmic totality that is also connected — especially in Daniel — with the question of world dominion (the titles of the Assyrian, Babylonian, and Persian kings include "king of the four ends of the earth").

The four "living creatures" with wings (Ezk. 1:5; identified in 10:15,20 with the cherubim that bear up Yahweh's glory) symbolize both the four winds and the divine omnipresence: "Wherever the *rûaḥ* would go, they went, without turning as they went" (1:12). The text says of the four conjoined wheels that "the *rûaḥ* of the living creatures" was in them (vv. 20-21). The Essenes of Qumran incorporated this motif into the liturgy of their sabbath sacrifice.[65] The number four, associated with the winds, and the mention of *ḥayyôṯ*, associated with the "spirit," illustrate once again

65. See VII below.

how the two meanings of the word *rûaḥ*, "wind" and "spirit," intertwine in Ezekiel. This usage may also echo earlier notions of the wind as a cherub on which Yahweh flies (cf. Ps. 18:11[10]).

Ezekiel's inaugural vision must be seen in combination with the concluding description of the new temple and the vision of Yahweh's entry (Ezk. 40–43), where the four points of the compass likewise play an important role. In 42:16-20 these are specified by naming the associated "wind" *(rûaḥ)*. This usage is not found elsewhere in the OT, but influenced the intertestamental literature, especially the Temple Scroll.[66] The square plan of the temple with a gate at each cardinal point symbolizes how Yahweh reaches out from his dwelling place in Jerusalem, pervading the whole world with his *rûaḥ*. This notion explains the theme of the scattering of the people "to every wind" (11QT 5:2,10,12; 12:14; 17:21) and their restoration and revival with the aid of the "four winds" (37:9,12,14). In Zec. 6:5 the four winds are represented metaphorically as four chariots with their horses. Here too older conceptions of the winds as Yahweh's "messengers" (Ps. 104:4) may lie in the background.

The OT does not concern itself with questions about the "nature" of things. Observations of the physical world are registered, but they are always associated intimately with human experience and put in the service of analogical thought and metaphorical imagery. So the winds too are not really treated as "natural phenomena": the shaking of trees in the wind is an image of fear (Isa. 7:2); the gloomy north wind, bringing rain, suggests angry faces (Prov. 25:23). "They sow the wind and they shall reap the whirlwind," the prophet says of Ephraim (Hos. 8:7); the context makes clear that the "wind" stands metaphorically for the calf of Samaria and the "whirlwind" for the impending Assyrian invasion.

The wisdom *māšāl* often uses the wind as a metaphor: no one has the power to restrain the wind or to avert the day of death (Eccl. 8:8); no one knows the way of the wind — so no one knows the works of God (11:5). Here the wind has become a metaphor for the mystery of existence.

2. *God's Wind.*

a. *Survey.* The wind is often viewed as an instrument of God's action; only once (Am. 4:13) is it stated expressly that Yahweh "creates the wind." The creation texts themselves never mention the creation of the wind. According to Gen. 1:2, the *rûaḥ* of creation is preexistent (either as an element of chaos or, more likely, as God's creative energy). In the other texts, the wind is always taken into Yahweh's service: he makes a wind blow over the earth so that the waters subside (Gen. 8:1); he drives an east wind upon the land, bringing locusts (Ex. 10:13), then changes it into a strong west wind, to drive the locusts away (v. 19). Yahweh brings the four winds upon Elam (Jer. 49:36); he makes a stormy wind break out, with a destructive deluge of rain and hailstones (Ezk. 13:13); he hurls a great wind upon the sea (Jon. 1:4) and sends a sultry east wind (4:8); he "brings out the wind from his storehouses" (Jer. 10:13 = 51:16; cf. Ps.

66. See VII below.

135:7); he "gathers the wind in the hollow of his hand" (Prov. 30:4); he "makes the winds his messengers" (Ps. 104:4); he raises the wind (107:25) and makes it blow (147:18).

The instrumental function of the wind is made clear by the prep. *b*[e]: Yahweh "drove the sea back *by* a strong east wind" (Ex. 14:21); *at* the blast of his anger the waters piled up (15:8); he blew *with* his wind, and the sea covered the Egyptians (v. 10); *by* his wind the heavens were made fair (Job 26:13).

A wind from *(mē'ēṯ)* Yahweh brought quails from the sea (Nu. 11:31). Yahweh "scatters to every *(l*[e]*kol)* wind": Kedar (Jer. 49:32), Elam (Jer. 49:36), the inhabitants of Jerusalem (Ezk. 5:10,12; 12:14), like chaff driven by the wind from the desert (Jer. 13:24), like the east wind (Jer 18:17). Yahweh flies (2 S. 22:11 par. Ps. 18:11[10]) or rides (Ps. 104:3) "on the wings of the wind."

In the vast majority of instances, therefore, *rûaḥ* in the sense of "wind" is associated directly with God's active intervention. Some fifteen texts speak explicitly of *rûaḥ yhwh* or *rûaḥ *[e]*lōhîm,* or use a pronominal suffix: Gen. 1:2; Ex. 15:8,10; 1 K. 18:12; 2 K. 2:16; Isa. 11:15; 27:8; 30:28; 40:7; 59:19; Hos. 13:15 (cf. Jer. 23:19; 30:23); Ps. 18:16(15) par. 2 S. 22:16 (cf. Ps. 83:16[15]; Job 37:10). In some passages exegetes have suggested interpreting the phrase with *[e]*lōhîm* as a superlative: a "mighty wind" or "godly wind."[67] The texts in question are 1 K. 18:12; 2 K. 2:16; Isa. 59:19, possibly also Hos. 13:15, and above all Gen. 1:2. Winton Thomas points out, however, that although the name of God sometimes has superlative implications, nowhere is there clear evidence that such a meaning has totally displaced the original genitive sense *(gen. auctoris).* In Gen. 1:2 a translation such as "mighty wind" might be possible, but would represent a departure from all other instances.

b. *Meteorological Phenomena.* The close association of the wind with Yahweh may be explained against the background of ancient conceptions of theophany, which viewed violent natural phenomena as manifestations of God. The OT theophany accounts vary extensively: for example, the description of the Sinai theophany speaks of lightning, thunder, clouds, smoke, fire, and earthquake, but not wind (Ex. 19:16-19); other texts speak of earthquake, clouds, and rain (Jgs. 5:4-5; cf. Ps. 68:8-10) or contain motifs associated with light (Dt. 33:2 [cf. Ps. 50:2; 80:2(1); 94:1]; Hab. 3:4). The continuation of the psalm of Habakkuk uses the imagery of a storm theophany to picture Yahweh's intervention against the enemies of his people (cf. Ps. 77:17-21[16-20]). Yahweh's arrows are the lightning; his "horses and chariots" (Hab. 3:8,15) are probably the wind, with the aid of which he drives back the waters of chaos. Isa. 30:27-33, too, uses the imagery of a storm theophany to depict Yahweh's intervention against Assyria: "His breath *(rûḥô)* is like an overflowing stream that reaches up to the neck" (v. 28). In the theophany of Ps. 18:8-16(7-15) par. 2 S. 22:8-16, the wind plays a double role: it transports Yahweh on its wings (v. 11), but it is also Yahweh's breath (v. 16), just as the thunder is his voice (v. 14) and the lightning his arrows (v. 15). It is not impossible that such language was once understood literally (cf. Ps. 29). The present texts

67. J. M. P. Smith, *AJSL* 44 (1927/28) 108-15; D. Winton Thomas, *VT* 3 (1953) 209-24.

more likely use it figuratively, but with a certain realism — in a time when natural phenomena appeared mysterious, there was doubtless some incentive to invoke direct divine agency as an explanation (cf. Job 36:26-33; 37:2-18).

The constitutive elements of the traditional poetic symbolism deserve our attention. Association of the wind with the wings of a bird or a cherub is common (cf. Ps. 104:3). According to Hos. 4:19, a wind will "wrap *(ṣārar)* in its wings" apostate Ephraim and carry it off; this passage also draws on the image of the fringes of a robe (cf. Ezk. 5:3). "The wings of the morning" (Ps. 139:9) is a poetic expression for the morning wind (cf. also Job 38:13). The winged creatures in Ezk. 1, 10, and 43 were probably inspired by pictorial representations in the temple: Yahweh, enthroned on the cherubim in the temple, is thus identified with the God manifest in the wind. They reflect an ancient pictorial symbolism in which invisible, "spiritual" creatures were, like the wind, thought of as having wings.

It is important to note that the God of the storm theophanies remains hidden, just as the wind itself is invisible. The Egyptian wind god, Amun, is also "the one who hides himself" (see above).

Wind and clouds are also associated with Yahweh's "riding" (Dt. 33:26; Isa. 19:1; 66:15; Ps. 68:5,34[4,33]; cf. Zec. 6:1; Hab. 3:8,15; Ps. 77:17-20[16-19]). This image conveys an impression of strength and speed, and is linked with Yahweh's intervention as a warrior. References to this intervention allude to the battle with chaos, in which Yahweh drove back the sea with the aid of the wind (Ps. 18:16[15]; cf. Hab. 3:10,15; Ps. 77:17-20[16-19]; also Ex. 14:21; 15:8,10; Isa. 11:15; 17:12-13; Nah. 1:3-4); cf. also Yahweh's "rebuke"[68] with the help of the wind (Isa. 17:13; Nah. 1:4; Ps. 104:7; 106:9).

c. *Yahweh's Judgment.* The storm theophanies symbolize primarily Yahweh's military intervention to deliver king and nation; his coming in judgment is often represented instead by the image of the parching east wind, which drives away leaves, dust, and — during winnowing — chaff. This image is particularly suited to represent the separation of good from evil and was also borrowed by the NT (Mt. 3:12; Lk. 3:17). God's own people are judged in Isa. 27:8; 64:5; Jer. 13:24; 18:17; Hos. 13:15; the enemy army as an instrument of punishment can be likened to a whirlwind (Hos. 8:7; Hab. 1:11) — an image found throughout the ancient Near East, e.g., in the Chronicle of Esarhaddon: "I spread my wings like the flying storm to vanquish my enemies."[69] The wind also accompanies judgment on Israel's enemies (Ps. 83:14[13]); Israel itself, like a threshing sledge, will thresh and winnow its enemies, and the wind will carry them away (Isa. 41:15-16; cf. also Ps. 1:4; 35:5; Job 21:18). In describing the universal judgment of the eschaton, Trito-Isaiah echoes the ancient epiphanies: "Yahweh will come in fire, and his chariots like the whirlwind" (Isa. 66:15).

The frequent association of wind and judgment probably also bears on the interpretation of Gen. 3:8. Yahweh comes to the garden *l^erûaḥ hayyôm.* The common translation "in the cool of the evening" oversimplifies the problem. It is significant that

---

68. → גער *gā'ar.*
69. T. Bauer, *ZA* 42 (1932) 171ff.; *ANET,* 289.

hayyôm, "the day,"[70] is a traditional topos for Yahweh's intervention. Here there is good reason to see a specific allusion to Yahweh's words in 2:17: "In the day that you eat of it you shall die." Thus the phrase in 3:8 means not simply "the cool of the day" but more specifically "the wind of the very same day," in this case the day of eating. It is also significant that Yahweh makes his "voice" heard but does not appear in recognizable visible form. Finally, the verb *hālaḵ* (here the hithpael ptcp., "walking about in the garden") can be associated as a verb of motion with the wind: possibly the narrator wishes to suggest a manifestation of God in the wind.

d. *Creation.* Debate is still in progress over the role of *rûaḥ* at the creation of the world. Most of the discussion focuses on the interpretation of Gen. 1:2: *wᵉrûaḥ ʾᵉlōhîm mᵉraḥepeṯ ʿal-pᵉnê hammāyim.* The primary question is not whether to translate *rûaḥ* as "spirit" or "wind"; even so, the translation "spirit" is less appropriate, because it might suggest the notion of a vital cosmos, otherwise alien to the OT, or the notion of a distinct being, as such inconceivable in the OT alongside *ʾᵉlōhîm.*[71] The crucial question, though, is whether to interpret the construct phrase as a genitive ("God's wind/breath") or a superlative ("a mighty wind"). A major argument for the latter is that God's creative word plays the active role in Gen. 1, whereas the *rûaḥ ʾᵉlōhîm* has nothing to do with God's creative activity and therefore belongs to the chaos before creation, along with the primal deep.[72]

This argument conflicts, however, with the observation that water and wind appear as polar opposites in ancient Near Eastern cosmogonies. Citing the motif of the ancient Near Eastern battle with chaos, Ridderbos in particular correctly assumed that in Gen. 1 *tᵉhôm* and *rûaḥ* are, in principle, antagonists. He interpreted *rûaḥ ʾᵉlōhîm* as "a wind sent by God," roaring against the primal deep: "Its function is to make the earth dry out, or, if you like, to battle the waters."[73] Following this interpretation, Scheepers translates the clause adversatively: "But God's wind swept over the waters."[74] The LXX, too, sees an adversative relationship: *kaí pneúma theoú epephéreto epánō toú hýdatos.*

The qal of *rḥp,* the verb used in Gen. 1:2, appears in Jer. 23:9 ("shake"), the piel in Dt. 32:11 ("hover"). In the latter passage, the piel form with the prep. *ʿal* corresponds to Gen. 1:2: the meaning has to do with the movement of wings, and the association with the wind is significant. Furthermore, if the piel of *rḥp* has aggressive or provocative connotations, as in Dt. 32:11, then Gen. 1:2 could refer to an aggressive movement of the wind against the deep, a theme that appears several times in the context of driving back or drying up the waters of chaos (Isa. 17:13; 50:2; Nah. 1:3-4; Ps. 18:16[15] par. 2 S. 22:16; Ps. 106:9).

It is generally true for both the OT and the ancient Near East that the starting point for the origin of the world is not simply chaos, but rather a fundamental preexisting po-

70. → יום *yôm.*
71. Cf., e.g., Johnson, *Vitality,* 32-33, with bibliog.
72. → תהום *tᵉhôm.*
73. Ridderbos, 244.
74. Scheepers, 246-60.

larity. At Hermopolis, for example, this polarity involved the primal wind (Amun/Amaunet) and the pairs of gods associated with chaos, including the primal deep (Nun/Naunet). The beginning of the Babylonian creation epic is marked by the sexual polarity Apsu/Tiamat, from which the generations of the gods arise.[75] In Gen. 2:5 we find the polarity of the dry earth and rain, the preexisting conditions for human life. In the Babylonian epic the primal polarity is reinforced by the motif of conflict and battle, giving expression to a dualistic worldview. Here too the winds play an active role as Marduk's weapons. Because Gen. 1 contains many allusions to the Babylonian epic, v. 2 may refer to this battle. In the P creation account, however, no trace of dualism and the mythological drama is left: the primal deep is not a hostile power, but merely the symbolic instantiation of passive, powerless, formless primordial matter, from which nothing can arise by its own power. It is met by the wind or breath that emanates from God, a kind of metaphor representing the primal energy that embodies the active potential of creation. As a divine attribute, like the primal deep, it is present before creation.

The process actualized is initiated by God's speaking: God's word makes the creative energy effectual. We find the same notion in Ps. 33:6: "By the word of Yahweh the heavens were made, by the breath of his mouth all their host"; the same parallelism of *dāḇār* and *rûaḥ* appears in Ps. 147:18; 148:8. "The word, which lends substance to the breath of the mouth, probably marks the beginning of the bridge leading to a truly spiritualized interpretation of the breath, the idea of 'spirit' in the strict sense."[76] All of these considerations show that the meaning "mighty wind" for *rûaḥ *ᵉlōhîm* is unlikely.[77]

Other texts, too, record the active role of the wind in the creation of the world. Ps. 104:2b-4 mentions the winds in connection with the separation of the upper region of the vault of heaven from the lower (cf. Gen. 1:6-8, the second day of creation). In the context of creation, this language recalls the mythological motif of the separation of heaven and earth by the god of the air (Enlil, Shu); in Ps. 104, however, the primary model was the traditional storm theophany (cf. esp. Ps. 18:11[10]). The wind also plays a role in separation of water and earth, the first work of the third day in Gen. 1: Ps. 104:5-9 furnishes a vivid poetic description of God's laying the foundations of the earth and of the primal waters covering it, waters that flee at Yahweh's "rebuke." The storm theophany alluded to here is thus a direct outgrowth of the statement that the winds are Yahweh's servants (v. 4), thus recalling the motif of the battle with chaos and the driving back of the primal waters by the wind. It is unlikely that the storm theophany was inherently a creation motif, but Ps. 104 introduced it into the work of creation (cf. 18:16[15]).

The separative function of the air, dividing the heavens from the deep or from the earth, gave the wind its place in the origins of the cosmos, where, in both the Babylonian epic and the OT, the dynamic aspect of the Semitic storm god comes to the fore.

75. EnEl, I, 1-9.
76. Hehn, 220.
77. See 2.a above.

But neither in the OT nor in the ancient Near East did the wind play a role in the subsequent ordering of the world. The appearance of the *rûaḥ* once more at the end of Ps. 104, as the vitalizing spirit of Yahweh, suggests a continuity in the work of creation. The word *rûaḥ* occupies a signal position at the beginning and end of the psalm, framing precisely the description of the work of creation. In contrast to Gen. 1:3-5, where light is the first thing to be created, in Ps. 104:2 light is a divine attribute, existing before creation, precisely like the *rûaḥ* in Gen. 1:2. Despite all the parallels, the sequence light-*rûaḥ* in Ps. 104 is the reverse of the sequence in Gen. 1. This reversal recalls the difference between the cosmogonies of Hermopolis and Heliopolis. Light and wind prove to be the fundamental metaphors from the natural realm for speaking about the nature and activity of God.

The P account of creation bespeaks a threefold principle of creation: first the *rûaḥ* *ᵉlōhîm,* which drives back the waters of chaos, then the spoken creative word *(dāḇār),* and finally light *('ôr).* They are logically connected: with respect to human vision and understanding, the work of creation as a whole is visible revelation. As such, however, it bears witness to its mysterious source in God's invisible, creative energy, God's *rûaḥ.* The transition is effected by the powerful creative word, which can be called "breath of the mouth." In contrast to Ps. 104, Gen. 1 gives priority to the *rûaḥ* and treats light as part of the created world. This treatment fits with the general OT picture of God: Yahweh was associated more with the invisible wind than with light; he is the hidden God, revealed only in his works.

V. Breath or Spirit.

1. *Divine* rûaḥ *and Human Nature.* Gen. 2:7 describes the constitution of human beings: "*yhwh* *ᵉlōhîm* formed man from the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life *(nišmaṯ ḥayyîm).*" Although the word *rûaḥ* does not appear here, it is perceived as synonymous, so that it does appear in similar statements elsewhere: Yahweh gives *rûaḥ* and *nᵉšāmâ* (Isa 42:5); he forms the human *rûaḥ* within (Zec. 12:1). "The spirit of God *(rûaḥ-'ēl)* has made me, and the breath of Shaddai *(nišmaṯ šadday)* gives me life" (Job 33:4).

According to Gen. 3:19, everything returns to its source — earth to earth; but what happens to the breath of life the text does not say. Gen. 6:3 is similar: "My spirit *(rûḥî)* shall not abide in mortals forever." Ps. 104:29-30 is somewhat clearer: when Yahweh "takes away" or "collects" *('āsap)* his breath, all living things "die and return to their dust" (cf. Job 34:14-15: God takes back spirit and breath). Eccl. 12:7 says more explicitly: "The dust returns to the earth, as it was, but the breath *(rûaḥ)* returns to God who gave it." These passages make clear that whenever a text speaks of the fundamental constitution of human beings, nothing explicit is said of a person's own *rûaḥ* (Zec. 12:1 being the only possible exception), but rather of God's *rûaḥ* (or a *rûaḥ* from God) within the person. Precisely because God is the source of this *rûaḥ,* it returns to God at death. No one has power over the beginning and end of life (Eccl. 8:8); the life span *(ḥayyîm)* between them is bestowed on each person, but it too presupposes the ongoing presence of God's *rûaḥ.* Thus Job swears (Job 27:3-4): "As long as my breath *(nišmāṯî)* is in me and the breath of God *(rûaḥ* *ᵉlôah)* is in my nostrils, my lips will not speak

falsehood." When death approaches, Yahweh is invoked as "God of the breath of life in all flesh" (Nu. 16:22; 27:16; cf. Job 12:10). But Yahweh "sends forth" *(šālaḥ)* his spirit once more (Ps. 104:30) — just like the wind — and all living creatures are created (*br'* niphal) anew.

After the analogy of the waxing and waning wind, life — including life as experienced by the individual, becomes a continual ebb and flow of vital energy, ultimately as Yahweh sends forth and takes away his *rûaḥ,* but also dependent on eating and drinking (Ps. 104:27-28) and inward emotions. Life and death, too, are made comprehensible by the analogy of the wind. Human life in its totality is renewed and sustained by God's *rûaḥ.*

Johnson seeks to derive the vitalizing energy of *rûaḥ* directly from the meaning "wind"; Albertz and Westermann rightly disagree.[78] When Ps. 104:29-30 speaks of God's taking away and sending *rûaḥ,* the analogy of the wind is clearly intentional; this language reinforces the impression that the two meanings "wind/creative energy" and "vitalizing spirit" overlap at the beginning and end of the psalm.

When the constitution of human beings is involved, the word *rûaḥ* proves to be a relational term, comparable to the notion of the "image of God" used by P. Just as the latter relates human beings to God as their exemplar, so *rûaḥ* denotes their dynamic relationship with God. Undoubtedly the word conveys not only causal dependence but also the singular dignity of human life. In the anthropology of the OT, the "spirit" signifies the *pars intima* as the distinct constituent of the individual "person," transcending corporeality; at the same time, this "spirit" is associated with the person's experience and awareness of God. Not just the OT but the totality of ancient Near Eastern civilization is permeated by this understanding as an irreducible postulate of human existence: "How divine is that by which one lives," says an Egyptian hymn to Osiris. "The breath of the Almighty gives me life" (Job 33:4).

There are, however, several ambiguities in this understanding of life. It is striking that the OT makes no distinction between the independent creaturely spirit or life pervading the individual and the *rûaḥ* as God's dynamic and vitalizing inward presence. We note the same ambiguity with respect to *rûaḥ* in the sense of "wind": was it thought of immediately as God's dynamically creative, beneficent, and angry presence in the world, or as an autonomous entity created by God? Only one text (Am. 4:13) asserts the latter explicitly. Also not very explicit is the distinction between human beings and animals. Several OT passages emphasize the special status of humans: e.g., J speaks of God's breathing the breath of life on humans (Gen. 2:7), not animals. In other passages, however, the breath of life *(rûaḥ ḥayyîm)* is shared by all living creatures (Gen. 6:17; 7:22 [P]). Ps. 104:29-30 makes no distinction. For Qoheleth there is no difference between humans and animals — they all have the same *rûaḥ* (Eccl. 3:19-20). But behind the question that follows in v. 21 — "Who knows whether the human *rûaḥ* goes upward and the *rûaḥ* of animals goes downward to the earth?" — stands the interesting idea of a difference in their fates. When the skeptical

78. Johnson, *Vitality,* 24-25; Albertz and Westermann, 736.

Qoheleth here questions the return of the human *rûaḥ* to God, he is in conflict with 12:7. The statement that humans and animals have "one *rûaḥ*" means that the same *rûaḥ* of God quickens them, each in its own way; it does not necessarily imply that they must share the same fate at death.

This theme, appearing in a late document, is not discussed at all in early texts. It does show, however, that the traditional statements "the *rûaḥ* returns to God" and "God gathers the *rûaḥ*" are open to a variety of interpretations. Both here and elsewhere, talk about the ultimate fate of humans bespeaks a conscious, accepted agnosticism, which has nothing in common with the resigned skepticism of Qoheleth: life comes from God and returns to God; therefore the worshiper can trust in God and return to God what belongs to God: "Into your hand I commit my spirit" (Ps. 31:6[5]).

Thus human beings and all living creatures belong to a single, all-inclusive domain of life, because they all share the same *rûaḥ* of God. But just as this perspective tends to lose sight of the independence of the individual human spirit as the creation of God, so do we find only ambiguous and in part contradictory notions concerning the fate of the individual. Total annihilation at death was apparently inconceivable. There was a notion of "spirits" of the dead, but these are called → אוֹב *'ôḇ,* not *rûaḥ* (Lev. 19:31; 20:6,27; Dt. 18:11; Isa. 8:19; 19:3; 29:4).

Also among the ambiguous notions is that of descent into the netherworld, which some texts present as the inevitable end of life (Job 7:9). Most often, however, the boundary between life and death is oddly fluid and relative. Every affliction brings the victim close to the realm of the dead — from which, however, Yahweh is able to deliver the sufferer. In this view Sheol is a realm outside the sphere of Yahweh's dominion, which is also the sphere of his *rûaḥ*. If Ps. 104:29-30 presupposes the notion of survival of the individual after death, the assertion that Yahweh takes away and sends forth his *rûaḥ* becomes an assertion about the revitalization of the individual. If so, even when the individual's physical death is at issue, Sheol would be relativized, a domain that is ultimately still within the sphere of influence of the quickening divine *rûaḥ*. But the OT does not speak with a single or clear voice about either possibility.

Ezk. 37 describes a restoration of the dead to life, in which the *rûaḥ* plays a crucial role. In a certain sense the Yahwist's description of the creation of humankind (Gen. 2:7) probably served as a model for the vision. As so often, however, death seems here to be more a symbolic representation of present adversity, and restoration to life an image for the hope of return from exile (cf. v. 14). The boldness of the description is extraordinary, however, and it is hard to avoid asking whether there is not more behind it. Thus, for the time being, an answer to the question of resurrection is only hinted at in Ezk. 37.

2. *Human rûaḥ.* When *rûaḥ* does not refer to the vitalizing spirit of God, it refers to the vital force of humans themselves, which finds expression in mental activity, abilities, and emotions. In this context, too, the OT thinks in terms of external influences, emanating from the divine *rûaḥ* or from an evil spirit. This is clear when the text deals with extraordinary abilities or passions and emotions that the individual cannot control. The principal possibility of external influence is the notion of a charismatic endow-

ment and the "holy spirit," which can alter the interior of the individual. Some texts, however, do not distinguish clearly what is viewed as an expression of the individual's own vital force and what is thought to come from without.

The person's own *rûaḥ* is the source of phenomena associated with aggressiveness, whether anger or courage as the virtue of one's own spiritual strength: these are simply called *rûaḥ* without further qualification. The meaning "anger" appears in Jgs. 8:3; Isa. 25:4; Job 15:13; other texts speak similarly of God's anger: Zec. 6:8; Ps. 139:7.[79] Controlling one's *rûaḥ* is an important virtue (Prov. 16:32; 29:11), although other expressions of feelings and emotions are assessed positively as expressions of life. "Courage," too, is called simply *rûaḥ* (Nu. 27:18; Josh. 2:11; 5:1; Isa. 19:3).

In construct phrases *rûaḥ* can also stand for expressions of temperament: cold-bloodedness (Prov. 17:27), passion (Ezk. 3:14), impatience (Prov. 14:29; cf. Job 21:4; Mic. 2:7), long-windedness (Eccl. 7:8). Among emotions we find *ṣar-rûaḥ,* "anguish" (Job 7:11); *mōraṯ rûaḥ,* "bitterness" (Gen. 26:35); *šeḇer rûaḥ,* "desperation" (Isa. 65:14; cf. Prov. 15:4: "heartache"). Among the moral dispositions humility occupies a key position, especially in the exilic and postexilic periods: Yahweh's presence is promised to the "contrite" and "humble" *(šᵉp̄al-rûaḥ);* he revives the "spirit of the humble" *(rûaḥ šᵉp̄ālîm,* Isa. 57:15). The same piety speaks in Ps. 51:19(17), which states that a "broken spirit" *(rûaḥ nišbārâ)* is the sacrifice acceptable to God (cf. Ps. 34:19[18]; Prov. 16:19; 29:23). "Haughtiness" can be called *gōḇah rûaḥ* (Prov. 16:18; cf. Eccl. 7:8).

The psalmist prays to God for a "steadfast spirit" (*rûaḥ nāḵôn,* Ps. 51:12[10]) and a "willing spirit" (*rûaḥ nᵉḏîḇâ,* v. 14[12]), as well as (addressing God) "your holy spirit" (*rûaḥ qoḏšᵉḵā,* v. 13[11]). Just as steadfastness and willingness qualify the human spirit, so the "holy spirit" is God's own dynamic presence, God's spirit within. The "spirit of wisdom" *(rûaḥ ḥoḵmâ)* is a special power or inspiration emanating from God, such as is required for making the priestly vestments (Ex. 28:3) or the tent of meeting and the sacred vessels (31:3; 35:31 [P]). This wisdom refers to artistic skill; but because it reveals an extraordinary talent, it can be interpreted as divine inspiration. The *rûaḥ ḥoḵmâ* is also an element of the royal charisma (Isa. 11:2; cf. 1 K. 3), but is not reserved to those with charismatic gifts.

A special problem is presented by the evil inclinations and psychological forces that hold sway in human beings and are described as being instilled by God. Jgs. 9:23 says: "God sent *(šālaḥ)* an evil spirit *(rûaḥ rāʿâ)* between Abimelech and the lords of Shechem." Lindström sees in this *rûaḥ* "an attitude of mind," neither an evil demon nor God's *rûaḥ;* the divine "sending" he explains as deriving from the extended context of the original narrative, which simply illustrates a general theological principle: God governs the actions of individuals so that the evil they do has negative consequences for them.[80] The story of Saul speaks of a *rûaḥ-ʾᵉlōhîm rāʿâ* (1 S. 16:15,16,23; 18:10) or *rûaḥ yhwh rāʿâ* (19:9) or *rûaḥ-rāʿâ mēʾēṯ yhwh* (16:14), an "evil spirit from God,"

79. But cf. Briggs, 145: "the identification of the רוּחַ with the divine Presence."
80. Lindström, 77.

which torments Saul after the *rûaḥ yhwh,* the charismatic spirit with which he had formerly been endowed, departed from him (16:14). The evil spirit even drives him into a prophetic frenzy (*nb'* hithpael, 18:10). Lindström believes that this story is based on a tradition that originally spoke only of Saul's own anguished spirit, embodying the common motif of a king whose troubled spirit leads him to seek help (cf. Gen. 41:8; Dnl. 2:1,3).[81] The "evil spirit" from God was introduced in a later redaction as a negative counterpart to the royal charisma. Reinterpretation and extension of the earlier tradition lent expression to the notion of Saul's rejection. Lindström finds no evidence here of an earlier belief in demons.

In the account of Micaiah ben Imlah (1 K. 22:19-22), "the spirit" appears before Yahweh as a personal being and offers to be a "lying spirit" *(rûaḥ šeqer)* in the mouth of the false prophets, because Ahab does not want to hear anything but lies; thus the king brings disaster upon himself. Lindström interprets this *rûaḥ* as a personification of prophetic inspiration, facilitated by the notion of the assembly of the gods.[82] Clearly the present narrative embodies polemic against prophetic circles that sought to legitimize themselves through the inspiration of the "spirit." So here too it would be wrong to find a belief in demons; it would be equally wrong to speak of Yahweh as the direct author of evil. Other such phrases should probably be assessed similarly: "spirit of jealousy" (*rûaḥ-qin'â,* Nu. 5:14,30), "spirit of confusion" (*rûaḥ 'iw'îm,* Isa. 19:14), "spirit of deep sleep" (*rûaḥ tardēmâ,* Isa. 29:10). These texts, too, do not refer to external demons but rather to the confusion of the Egyptians and the obduracy of the Judahites in their own spirits. The statements that identify Yahweh as the source of these phenomena are associated with the problem of obduracy in the OT.

3. *Charisma.* The *rûaḥ* plays a much more specific role in the case of persons who are singled out by Yahweh to perform certain functions in the community. The endowment of a small, restricted group of people with "spirit" to perform such societal functions has been called "charismatic."[83] Charismatics in this sense include such figures as the "judges" and the preclassical prophets, but not the priests. The judges and prophets distinguished themselves through their extraordinary deeds, which gave them authority as leaders or messengers of God. As a direct gift from God, such charismatic spirit could neither be inherited nor tied to an official institution.

With the introduction of dynastic kingship, the spirit could be inherited and handed down without interruption, e.g., by anointing; this change reflects a different phenomenon. But such royal charisma appears only in the stories of Saul and David. Significantly, the account of Solomon's dream at Gibeon (1 K. 3), in which wisdom is bestowed on him, does not use the word *rûaḥ.* Subsequently we hear nothing more of kings endowed with the spirit, not even in the royal psalms. Not until Isa. 11:1-10 do

81. *Ibid.,* 78-84.

82. *Ibid.,* 84-91.

83. On the concept of "charisma," see M. Weber, *Grundriss der Socialökonomik* III (Tübingen, [3]1947), 124, 140-48, 753-57.

we hear of Yahweh's spirit resting upon the future Davidic king; but this text is probably an expression of eschatological expectations in the exilic or postexilic period.

A different notion lies behind the accounts describing the legitimation of a successor by inheritance of the spirit. Even in the earliest form of the tradition, Joshua is the classic OT successor figure (Dt. 31 is largely the product of later redaction, but the pre-Dtr tradition of the book of Joshua already presents Joshua as Moses' successor). To all appearances Elisha was represented as Elijah's successor quite soon after his role model was taken up (2 K. 2:8,13-14). But the inheritance of the spirit on a successor is native only to the Elijah-Elisha cycle (2 K. 2:9-15). Only P or later redactors speak of Moses bestowing on Joshua the "spirit of wisdom" by the imposition of his hands (Dt. 34:9, echoing Nu. 27:12-23).

The two parallel successors have been described as "concretions of Deuteronomic social ideals."[84] This reading overlooks the very ancient notion of the "spirit" in 2 K. 2:9-15 and in the rest of the Elijah-Elisha cycle, a notion that is clearly not an archaizing reconstruction attributable to Dtr redaction, but was present in the original traditions.

a. *Early Texts.* The picture of Moses as Israel's leader painted by the Pentateuch has nothing in common with the charismatic leaders of the book of Judges. Only one episode, Nu. 11:4-33, associates the *rûaḥ* with him; here a variant tradition describing the origin of the institution of elders has been woven into the story of the quails. This account mentions the *rûaḥ* six times, giving it thematic dominance. Yahweh takes some of the spirit that is on Moses and puts it on the elders, so that it "rests" (*nwḥ,* v. 25) upon them, whereupon they engage in ecstatic prophecy (*nb'* hithpael). The purpose of this text may have been to legitimate an institutional office, but the charismatic nature of the office is striking, especially when the text is compared with the appointment of judges to their office in Ex. 18, which does not mention *rûaḥ.* The universal dissemination of the prophetic spirit (Nu. 11:29) is a notion of the postexilic period, bringing the text close to Joel 3:1-2(2:28-29). The "resting" of the spirit recalls Isa. 11:2. The text is probably quite late and does not belong to any of the pentateuchal sources.

Apart from the late comment about Joshua in Dt. 34:9, only two other passages in the Pentateuch speak of a charismatic gift of the spirit. In Gen. 41:38 Pharaoh sees from Joseph's ability to interpret dreams that "a spirit of God is in him"; he is thus recognized also as a man who is "discerning and wise" and is placed over Pharaoh's house. There are no compelling reasons to consider this a late motif, even though the wise interpreter of dreams endowed with the spirit at the court of a foreign king does not appear again until the book of Daniel (Dnl. 2; 4; 5). In Nu. 24:2-3 the introduction to the last two cumulative oracles says that "the spirit of God" came upon Balaam, who proves to be a man "who hears the words of God, who sees the vision of Shaddai, of downcast and uncovered eye" (v. 4 par. v. 16).[85]

Thus Gen. 41:38 proves to be the only text in the earliest literary stratum of the Pen-

84. C. Schäfer-Lichtenberger, *ZAW* 101 (1989) 198-222.
85. On the age of the text, see W. Gross, *Bileam. SANT* 38 (1974).

tateuch that speaks of charismatic inspiration with the spirit. In the Pentateuch as a whole, the figure of the charismatic is endowed with the spirit; in this respect the book of Joshua resembles the Pentateuch. Only in the book of Judges do we find fundamentally different traditions concerning particular individuals, identifiable by their narrative structure: in the case of spirit-endowed charismatics, a single extraordinary feat is the focus of interest. In the Pentateuch as well as the book of Joshua, by contrast, individuals and their actions are subordinate to the broader chain of events; their functions are shaped by the overarching narrative trajectory.

The book of Judges describes the effects of endowment with the spirit concretely and vividly. In the Samson tradition possession of the spirit is itself the central theme. Jgs. 13:25 introduces the main narrative by saying that the *rûaḥ* of Yahweh began to stir him (cf. 14:6,19; 15:14). He received his extraordinary strength, the subject of the entire narrative, from the spirit of Yahweh, which "rushed on" *(ṣālaḥ)* him.

The *rûaḥ* of Yahweh "clothed" *(lāḇēš)* Gideon (Jgs. 6:34) and "came upon" *(hāyâ 'al)* Jephthah (11:29,32) and Othniel (3:10). Since the latter is an insignificant figure, this comment is probably a formulaic redactional frill.

Since the individual narratives have their own verbs for the coming of the spirit, these notions did not originate with the Dtr redaction but are rooted in the original individual traditions. If Saul's intervention in the war with the Ammonites (1 S. 11) is taken as the original beginning of his career, then he too continues the tradition of the judges, for "the spirit of God came upon him" (*ṣālaḥ,* vv. 6-7). The account of Saul's anointing as king uses the same verb twice for the coming of the spirit upon him (10:6,10). As one of the signs authenticating Saul's call, Samuel informs him that the *rûaḥ* of Yahweh will come upon him, so that he will be gripped by a prophetic frenzy and be turned into a different person (vv. 5-6; cf. vv. 9-15). This passage does not have to do with a spirit of fortuitous ecstasy but with the enduring charisma of the king; later (16:14) this spirit will be taken from him and given to David (v. 13), whose enduring possession of the spirit is expressed by the statement: *wattiṣlaḥ rûaḥ yhwh 'el-dāwiḏ mēhayyôm hahû' wāmā'lâ.*

The question remains whether the notion of the spirit was associated with the royal ideology and the anointing of the king from the beginning, or whether this association does not reveal a deliberate attempt to bring the Israelite kingship into continuity with earlier traditions, including those of the judges and the early prophets.[86] On the basis of literary analysis, Mettinger questions whether the anointing (1 S. 10:1) was associated from the outset with the mark of spirit-induced prophetic frenzy (vv. 2-7,10-13a). He sees behind the latter verses an older narrative in which kingship and spirit were associated. On the other hand, he finds no essential difference between the "prophetic" spirit of vv. 6 and 10 and the "martial" spirit of 11:6.

An archaic form of prophecy appears in a few texts.[87] This group includes not only Balaam (Nu. 24:2-3) and the band of prophets in 1 S. 10 (cf. also Nu. 11:14-

86. For a discussion of this issue, see Beyerlin; Mettinger, 233-53.
87. Van Imschoot, "L'action," 23; Jepsen, 12-40.

17,24b-30) but also the Elijah-Elisha traditions. The marks of this early prophecy include ecstatic frenzy (*nb'* hithpael) occasioned by the spirit. Such frenzy can be provoked by music (2 K. 3:15); it is contagious, infecting anyone who approaches (1 S. 19:20-23). Although a message can be transmitted by a person in this state (2 K. 3:15-19), the purpose of frenzy is not to produce prophetic speech. It is a transitory but repeatable phenomenon. By contrast, it is characteristic of Elijah and Elisha that they are endowed with the spirit at all times; only in this way can Elijah's spirit be passed on to Elisha.

This notion does not reflect an "institutionalization" of the spirit under the monarchy; its explanation comes from the Elijah-Elisha tradition itself. Although the wonders performed by these prophets are not ascribed explicitly to the *rûaḥ,* they do show Elijah to be a "man of God" (1 K. 17:18; 2 K. 1:9-11), and even more so Elisha, who is given this appellation some 17 times (2 K. 4:7,9,16; 5:8,20; etc.).

Unique to a few passages in the Elijah narrative is the suggestion that the prophet could be transported to another location by the *rûaḥ* (1 K. 18:12); indeed, at the end of his life, Elijah ascends into heaven in a whirlwind (*bass*^{e}*'ārâ,* 2 K. 2:1,11). The prophet's disciples surmise that Yahweh's *rûaḥ* has caught him up (v. 16). In these passages the word *rûaḥ* clearly means "wind."

This phenomenon recurs later in Ezekiel (3:12,14; 8:3; 11:1,24; 43:5; cf. 37:1). In his case, however, it is not always clear whether one should think in terms of a physical removal or simply a vision.[88]

In 1 S. 9:8 it is suggested that prophetic vision was viewed as an archaic phenomenon. Inspired by the *rûaḥ,* Balaam presents himself as a seer (Nu. 24:2-3). It is not clear that the interpretation of dreams was associated with early prophecy; in Gen. 41:38, however, the spirit enables Joseph to interpret dreams. Jeremiah's later polemic (Jer. 23:25-28) may suggest that dreams and their interpretation were an element of earlier prophetic practice.

These features of preclassical prophecy are associated in different ways with inspiration of the spirit. Eighth-century prophecy, however, took on a new character: nothing more is said of the spirit; instead, the word of Yahweh is the exclusive medium of revelation. This change ultimately made it necessary to write down the words of the prophets. In many respects, however, this development is already anticipated in Elijah, who appears frequently as a prophet of the word. In the center of the narrative concerning Elijah's encounter with Yahweh on Mt. Horeb (1 K. 19) stands the renewal of Elijah's prophetic commission. The basic questions are: how does Yahweh manifest himself to the prophet and what is the truth concerning Elijah's role as a prophet? The climax of the text is the "soft whisper" (v. 12), the "speaking voice" (v. 13), his conversation with Yahweh, and the renewal of his commission. The prophet can appeal to nothing other than the word of Yahweh, spoken in the midst of silence. It stands in contrast to *rûaḥ,* earthquake, and fire, motifs of old theophanies, i.e., demonstrations of

88. See G. Widengren, *Literary and Psychological Aspects of the Hebrew Prophets. UUÅ* (1948:10), 94-120.

God's miraculous might and power. Yahweh is not "in them," but they are not simply rejected: they "go before" him (v. 11). This account is both integrated and at odds with earlier prophecy.

b. *Later Texts.* Not until Ezekiel do several features of preclassical prophecy reappear: the inspiration of the spirit, frenzy, ecstatic visions, and transport to another place. The account of the prophet's call already describes the *rûaḥ* as entering into him (Ezk. 2:2) and making him stand on his feet to receive his commission. In nine additional passages, the *rûaḥ* plays an active role in the experiences, visions, and auditions of the prophet (3:12,14,24; 8:3; 11:1,5,24; 37:1; 43:5).

In the postexilic period there was further development of the notion of the spirit as medium of revelation: in the Chronicler's History not just prophets but other individuals speak under the influence of the spirit. In "the last words of David," a late text, the king says: "The spirit of Yahweh speaks in me, his word is upon my tongue" (2 S. 23:2). In Daniel it is "the spirit of the holy gods" (Dnl. 4:5[8]; cf. vv. 6,15[8,14]; 5:11).

Especially interesting are retrospective surveys of Israel's history, from which postulates governing the present and future are expected to emerge. Preexilic Dtn theology did not yet consider the *rûaḥ* to be the motive force of history, but an important role was assigned to the prophets who summoned the people to repentance (2 K. 17:13ff.). Zec. 7:12 takes up the theme in a summary of Israel's past: "They made their hearts adamant in order not to hear the law and the words that Yahweh Sabaoth had sent by his spirit through the former prophets." This text appears to look back on the prophets as a closed chapter, and raises the question whether the spirit of the "former prophets" represents a step toward the idea of inspired Scripture.

This theme finds similar embodiment in the great prayer of the people in Isa. 63:7–64:12: rebellion against "his holy spirit" stands in contrast to the memory of Moses, "within whom Yahweh put his holy spirit."

Looking back on the wilderness period, the great penitential prayer of the people in Neh. 9 says: "You gave your good spirit to instruct them" (v. 20), and "Many years you were patient with them, and warned them by your spirit through the prophets" (v. 30).

4. *Eschatology.* The hopes for the future associated on the one hand with the spirit are concentrated in the messiah, a figure embodying elements of the Davidic king and of the prophets. On the other hand, however, there is hope for a universal gift of the prophetic spirit. These two emphases, rooted in different traditions, never found a common synthesis.

Isa. 11:1-5 describes the awaited Davidic king. Three pairs of words describe the gifts of the spirit bestowed on him: the first pair, "wisdom and understanding," refers to his judicial office (cf. vv. 3b,4a); the second, "counsel and might," to his function as military leader (cf. vv. 4b-5); and the third, "knowledge and fear," to his relationship with Yahweh. A variant reading in the LXX brings the number of attributes to seven, laying the groundwork for the Christian doctrine of the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit.

The spirit-endowed servant of Yahweh in Isa. 42:1 is a composite figure. He will bring forth justice to the nations and instruct them in the *tôrâ.* Isa. 61:1-3 probably re-

fers to an awaited individual, anointed by Yahweh; with his anointing, the spirit comes upon him — a feature in which he resembles the prophets.

The idea of a universal outpouring of the prophetic spirit is probably rooted in Jer. 31:31-34, which speaks of a new covenant. This text reflects the covenant theology of Deuteronomy, which interprets the course of history as apostasy from the covenant with Yahweh. The new covenant will be based on obedience and knowledge of Yahweh: "I will put my law within them, and I will write it on their hearts" (v. 33). Thus the instruction given by the prophets and their special vocation will be superfluous, for all will know Yahweh (v. 34). This early exilic text does not mention the spirit. Closely related to it, however, is Ezk. 11:19-20: "I will give them a different heart and put a new spirit within them" (cf. 39:29). Isa. 59:21 also alludes explicitly to the words of Jer. 31:31ff.: "My spirit is upon you, and my words that I have put in your mouth shall not depart out of your mouth." This awaited spirit comes from Yahweh, giving instruction and promoting obedience; it is the "holy spirit" (Ps. 51:13[11]) or the "good spirit" (143:10). It is experienced in the present but still awaited in the future.

More than any other text, Joel 3:1-2(2:28-29) draws on the ecstasy, visions, and miracles of the early prophets in its promise of an "outpouring" of the spirit on all flesh at the eschaton.

VI. LXX. The LXX most commonly uses *pneúma* to translate *rûaḥ* (264 times); when the meaning is "wind," the LXX also uses *ánemos* (some 50 times).[89] Four times we find *pnoḗ*. But when *rûaḥ* refers to the inner forces and emotions of human beings, the variations multiply: *thymós* (6 times), *makrothymía, makróthymos, praúthymos, psychḗ* (twice each), *oligopsychía, oligópsychos, phrónēsis, kakophrosýnē,* etc. The Greek word *pneúma* was clearly less appropriate in this area. The LXX appears to have rendered the meanings of the Hebrew text accurately: "Attempts to detect a significant change in the meaning of *ruach,* resulting from its translation in terms of πνεῦμα, are unfounded."[90]

According to Hill, however, there may be a perceptible tendency to treat the spirit as an autonomous entity; as examples, he cites the translations of Ps. 51:13(11): *kaí tó pneúma tó hágion sou mḗ antanélēs ap' emoú,* and Isa. 63:10-11: *poú estin ho theís en autoís tó pneúma tó hágion,* where the article could point to hypostatization.[91] The translation of *(yhwh) ᵓᵉlōhê hārûḥōṯ lᵉḵol-bāśār* in Nu. 16:22 and 27:16 as *theós tṓn pneumátōn kaí pásēs sarkós* is the result of misreading *lᵉḵol-bāśār* as *wᵉḵol-bāśār.* This translation, however, presupposes a notion of "spirits" as autonomous incorporeal beings or "angels," such as appear, e.g., in apocalyptic literature (cf. 1 En. 39:12; 41:10: "lord of the spirits"). The translation of Ps. 104(103):4 is also noteworthy in this respect: *ho poiṓn toús angélous autoú pneúmata;* the LXX probably understood this text

89. On the translation of *rûaḥ* in LXX, see D. Hill, *Greek Works and Hebrew Meanings. SNSTMS* 5 (1967); Isaacs, 10-17; Schoemaker.

90. Isaacs, 14.

91. Hill, 218-19. Cf. Ringgren, *Word,* 165ff.

as a statement concerning the "spiritual" nature of angels. The quotation of this text in Heb. 1:7 also understands it as a statement about angels, as does the Vg.: *qui facis angelos tuos spiritus.*

Still uncertain, however, is Isaacs's conjecture that the designation of the angels as *pneúmata* is traceable to the LXX;[92] its translation of *rûaḥ* in some texts may have been influenced by late Jewish angelology. Conversely, according to Isaacs, the meanings of *rûaḥ* influence Gk. *pneúma;* only in Stoicism did this word have central importance: it was identified with the *lógos* or *noús* that permeates and quickens the world, as well as finding expression in the *psychḗ* of the individual.[93] Other schools of Greek philosophy and religion did not assign any particularly important role to the *pneúma.* The expression *pneúma theoú* used by the LXX, however, lent the word a new dimension: "In faithfully translating the Hebrew term *ruach* as πνεῦμα, when applied not only to wind, breath, and life, but also to God, the LXX plays a significant part in the development of its meaning in subsequent Greek literature."[94]

Tengström

VII. Later Literature.

1. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* The noun *rûaḥ* is very common in the Dead Sea Scrolls, with some 280 occurrences in published texts (75 in 1QH and associated fragments, 38 in 1QS, 15 in 1QM and 4QM, 9 each in CD and 11QT; the 54 occurrences in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice are esp. significant); in addition, there are some 200 occurrences in hitherto unpublished texts, plus some 30 occurrences in Aramaic. In the Dead Sea Scrolls we also find the masc. pl. form *rûḥîm,* probably a late formation (1QS 3:24; 4:23, etc.; always in a construct phrase). The usage of this form, especially its use in parallel with the fem. *rûḥôṯ* in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, illustrates the semantic turn in the meaning of *rûaḥ* in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Otherwise the meaning of *rûaḥ* is largely identical with its meaning in the OT, although we may note a few significant tendencies. The meaning "wind" appears in only a few passages: 1QH 1:10 ("strong winds"); 1QH fr. 19:3, "wings of the wind," borrowing from Ps. 104:3-4; 4Q381 46:6, "violent wind," serving also as an image for the annihilation of the wicked in 4QpPs37 3:8; cf. also the interesting wordplay that uses *rûḥôṯ* for the spirits of human beings and the *rûaḥ* of God as destructive wind (4Q185 1-2, 1:9-12; similarly 4Q381 29:3). In 1QH 7:29 *rûaḥ* appears to be used synonymously with → הבל *heḇel,* "wind, breeze."

Only once is an animal said to have *rûaḥ:* according to 1QM 4:12, the war horses of the troops in the decisive eschatological battle will be *'rwky rwḥ,* possibly "long of breath."

Use of *rûaḥ* in the technical sense of "direction, side" is characteristic of the Temple

92. Isaacs, 14.
93. *Ibid.,* 15-17.
94. *Ibid.,* 17.

Scroll (11QT 6:6; 30:10; 31:10; etc.), but is found also in descriptions of the new Jerusalem (2QNew Jerusalem [24] 1:2; 5Q15 1, 1:1,14; 2:6; cf. also 3Q15 7:5 and 4QM[a] 1-3 14).

a. *Anthropology.* The use of *rûaḥ* for the psychic human core where ethical decisions are made is clearly less common than in the OT. "Every individual receives and possesses the spirit in a naturalistic sense. . . . The spirit is created by God and bestowed as the natural principle of human life."[95]

Attributive nouns are almost always present; they are ambiguous, depending on the context. In humble self-abasement, the worshiper can call himself a "spirit of error" (*rwḥ htw'h,* 1QH 1:22), a "perverse spirit" (*rwḥ n'wh,* 1QH 3:21), or "spirit of wickedness" (*rwḥ rš'h,* 1QS 10:18-19). If we are not to relativize such expressions of humility, we must see them in the context of such expressions as "spirit of humility" (*rwḥ 'nwh,* 1QS 4:3), "broken spirit" (*rwḥ nšbrh,* 1QS 8:3), "spirit of error" (*rwḥ htw'h,* 1QH 1:22), and "errant spirit" (*tw'y rwḥ,* 4Q183 1, 2:6 [text?]), but also "spirit of flesh" (*rwḥ bśr,* 1QH 13:13; 17:25). This last expression does not anticipate the *sárx-pneúma* polarity of the NT, but signalizes the difference "between human insufficiency and divine omnipotence."[96] The worshiper strives to attain the "spirit of truth" (*rwḥ 'mt,* 1QS 4:21). With respect to outsiders, the worshiper's conduct is guided by the "spirit of concealment" (*rwḥ hstr,* 1QS 9:22), a kind of code of silence. This human spirit is completely and utterly God's creation (1QH 1:15; 15:22).

Of particular interest is the phrase *'nwy rwḥ,* "the poor of spirit" (1QM 14:7 par. 4QM[a]) in the light of Mt. 5:3. According to Lohfink, this expression refers to the Ebionite community members, who accept that in God's eyes they are inconsequential, humble, and broken, as well as those who are literally poor, humbled for the sake of the *tôrâ.*[97]

Many of these expressions in declarations of humility (esp. in 1QH) take on a different valence in 1QM and 1QS, both markedly dualistic: here they are not used in self-description but are applied instead to those outside the community. The usage paves the way for a "two spirits doctrine" — which, however, remains entirely within the framework of OT precedent (esp. in 1QS 3:13–4:26, the final redaction of the Manual of Discipline). The dichotomization of humanity (cf. 1QS 4:15ff.) — "sons of light" vs. "sons of darkness" in the terminology of 1QM — is displayed in divergent inclinations ("spirits"), the "spirit of truth" and the "spirit of wickedness."[98] The nature of the two groups is characterized in greater detail in 1QS 4:2-6 and 4:9-16.

The basic outline of the two spirits doctrine (sketched in 1QS 3–4) displays an internal inconsistency:

1. Each person's way of life is determined by two antithetical spirits (3:18), so that every individual is dominated by one of these two spirits (3:20-21).
2. Over and above this human dichotomy, however, the evil spirit can lead even a good person astray (3:24).

95. Nötscher, "Heiligkeit," 337.
96. Nötscher, *Geist,* 175.
97. See N. Lohfink, *Lobgesänge der Armen. SBS* 143 (1990).
98. Cf. Treves.

3. The good and evil spirits feud within the human heart (4:23).
4. At the time of salvation, God will deliver the faithful from the evil spirit (4:20-21).

This train of thought bespeaks the acceptance of dualism (of Iranian-Zoroastrian provenance?) on the part of the Qumran Essenes, but also their instinctive resistance to it.[99]

One of the central tasks of the *maśkîl* is to pass judgment on the spirit of each novice and assign him his place within the community (1QS 9:12ff.; cf. 5:20ff.; 6:17), as well to instruct the members of the community in the discernment of spirits (*myny rwḥwt,* 3:14). In this context, too, it remains true that God created both the "spirits of light" *(rwḥwt 'wr)* and of "darkness" (*ḥwšk,* 3:25); but God loves the former and hates the latter (4:1). From this statement it follows directly that each Qumran Essene is required to hate all the spirits of wickedness, of worthlessness, etc., and shun them. It is clear that, in the context of 1QS, this discernment of spirits has not yet developed into angelology.[100]

From here it is only a small step conceptually to a differentiated personification of these distinctive spirits, although the vocabulary alone does not always make this differentiation clear; the contrast between singular and plural is a major help in making the decision — cf. the "spirit of knowledge" as a virtue (1QS 4:3) and as an angel (1QH 3:22-23).

b. *Angelology.* This step is clearly taken in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, which exhibit a developed angelology.[101] They permit no doubt that the heavenly beings in question are independent entities: the central liturgy of the seventh sabbath speaks of these "eternal spirits" *(rwḥwt 'wlmym)* as having been created by the effectual word of God: "At the words of his mouth all divine beings come into existence and at the utterances of his lips all eternal spirits" (4Q403 1, 1:35 = 4Q405 4-5, 2). He is "lord over every spirit" (1QH 10:8).

Besides *'lym* (cf. Ps. 29:1; 89:7[6]) and *'lwhym,* "divine beings," *ml'kym,* "angels," *kwhnym,* "priests" (note the fem. form *kwhnwt* in 4Q403 1, 2:21, etc.), *mšrtym,* "servants," *nśy'ym,* "princes," and *r'wšym,* "heads," terms that seem in part to suggest a hierarchical assignment of these beings to the seven levels of the heavenly *d^eḇîr, rûḥîm/rûḥôṯ* is especially common as a term denoting angelic beings. The masculine and feminine forms appear to be semantically identical and interchangeable: cf. *rwḥwt 'lwhym* (4Q403 1, 2:8-9) and *rwḥy 'lwhym* (403 1, 1:43) (for similar promiscuous choice in combination with *pl',* cf. 4Q403 1, 2:10 and 11Q17 5-6, 2, and with *qwdš qwdšym* cf. 4Q403 1, 2:7 with 1:44). The appearances of these beings are not distributed equally among the liturgies of all the sabbaths, but their apparent concentration in the seventh, eighth, and eleventh may be due simply to the condition of the text.

The titles of these beings are all construct phrases of a superlative nature, which elude precise interpretation; they may simply represent fantastic flights of mystic spec-

99. For further discussion see Kuhn, 117-30.
100. For the discussion see Nötscher, Anderson, Treves.
101. C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice. HSS* 27 (1985), 23-38.

ulation (cf. their similarity to the literature of Merkabah and Heikalot mysticism). Furthermore, the constant use of these angelological terms in parallel and the striking redundancy of the texts do not suggest a precise hierarchy or specific functions. All these beings, however, have one task in common: the praise of God in the presence of the divine *kāḇôḏ* (e.g., 4Q403 fr. 1, 1:38-45). They are actors in this heavenly liturgy (4Q403 fr. 1, 2:7; 4Q405 fr. 23, 2:9) but also belong to the inventory of the sanctuary (11Q17 frs. 3-4, 4; 11Q17 frs. 5-6, 2). They reappear as decorations of God's chariot throne (4Q403 fr. 1, 2:1-3; 4Q405 fr. 19, 2-5; 4Q405 fr. 23, 1:9-10) and elements of the priestly vestments (4Q405 fr. 23, 2:7-8; 11Q17 fr. 8, 7:3). In addition, terminological associations underline their relationship with wisdom and knowledge (*rwḥy byn,* 4Q403 fr. 1, 1:37; *rwḥy d't wbynh,* 4Q405 17:3), probably a reminiscence of their earlier revelatory function (cf. 4Q401 fr. 14, 2:7).

The attempt to elucidate the hierarchy of angelic beings is fraught with difficulty; but it would seem, at least, that the various *rûḥîm/rûḥôṯ* in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice represent neither the heads of the various classes of angels (e.g., Michael and Melchizedek) nor the classes that exercise higher priestly functions.

A similar view appears also to find embodiment in 11Q13 (11QMelch), which likewise does not use *rûaḥ* for the highest angel. Here the group of angels around Belial are the "spirits of his lot" (*rwḥy gwrlw,* 11Q17 2:12,13), upon whom Melchizedek will execute divine judgment because they have departed from the law of God. It is in the council of the divine spirits that the *tôrâ* is rooted (4Q400 fr. 1, 1:5); thus the angels of this council are the "spirits of knowledge," in the power of God the judge (4Q403 fr. 1, 1:37).

c. *The Holy Spirit.* The Dead Sea Scrolls have little to say about the spirit of God, the holy spirit. Anderson ascribes this reticence to an increasing sense of divine transcendence, which admits only such expressions as *rwḥ qwdš* (1QS 8:16: the prophets impart revelation through [*bᵉ*] the holy spirit of *God* [cf. 4Q381 fr. 69, 4]; the author of the *Hodayoth* also acknowledges the guidance of this spirit [1QH 7:6-7; 12:11-12; 16:7,11) or *hrwḥ,* with the definite article (11Q13 2:18: the prophet is the "anointed of the spirit"; cf. CD 2:12). The holy spirit is the gift of God to the elect of the Qumran community, a power given to each member when he enters the community (1QH 13:19; 14:13; 16:11-12; 1Q34bis fr. 3, 2:7), which works within him for his salvation. The Blessings therefore ascribe this holy spirit to the high priest (1QSb 2:25). This gift, constitutive of election, makes its possessor pure (1QH 7:6-7; 16:11-12), covers his guilt (1QH fr. 2:13), gives him understanding (1QH fr. 14:13; 4QDibHamᵃ 4:5) and knowledge of divine mysteries (4QDibHamᵃ 12:11-12), and enables him to offer true worship (4QDibHamᵃ 16:6-7). Since this spirit empowers the community member to follow a new way of life (1QH 9:32; 16:7), it is best understood as a moral force within the individual.[102]

In the Manual of Discipline, however, the work of the holy spirit in the community member is also accompanied (because it is imperfect?) by the water of purification and the "spirit of truth" (1QS 3:6-9; 4:21-22).

---

102. Nötscher, *Geist,* 179.

According to the earliest portion of the Manual of Discipline, the holy spirit is constitutive of the Qumran community, which understands itself to be "established by the holy spirit for eternal truth" (1QS 9:3). It is clear, nonetheless, that the Qumran Essenes did not think of the holy spirit as a person, since it is never assigned personal independence.

2. *Other Literature.* Continuing the process begun at Qumran, intertestamental and rabbinic literature greatly expanded the semantic valency of *rûaḥ*.

In the first instance, *rûaḥ* still means "wind" or "direction" (1 En. 36:1; 76:5,6; etc.). The "four winds of heaven" (*'rbʿ rwḥy šmy'*; cf. 76:10,14) implies the notion of totality (see also 1QapGen 22:8;[103] 11QtgJob 33:8; 32:6; etc.).

Everywhere in this late period we may note a semantic confluence of *rûaḥ* and *nepeš*, although there is not the slightest evidence for a distinction between spirit and soul (cf. Sir. 16:17). In 1QapGen 2:13,20, the *rûaḥ* is the seat of human emotions, an identification that brings this term in proximity to *lēḇ*. 1 En. 22:5-6 (reconstructed from 4QEn^{c+d+e}) uses *rûaḥ* for the spirit or shade of someone who has died, in this case Abel. This spirit dwells in a place where the souls *(npšwt)* of all human beings assemble.

The widespread conviction that the gift of the "holy spirit" had ceased in Israel with the destruction of the first temple led people to expect an outpouring of the holy spirit upon all Israel in the future age of salvation; nevertheless, the continued existence of this gift in the case of certain outstanding individuals was considered possible. First and foremost, the son of man is endowed with the "spirit of righteousness" (1 En. 62:2) and the spirit of wisdom and understanding (49:3). The royal messiah receives his power through the holy spirit (Pss. Sol. 17:37; cf. 18:7). The priestly messiah, too, is endowed with the spirit of understanding and holiness (T. Levi 18:7). Finally, all the faithful will receive the spirit of God, although this statement is ambivalent: anthropologically, it means a new spirit (4 Esd. 6:26; cf. Ezk. 36:26-27; 37:14), but dynamistically it means the spirit of God.[104] Each person receives this spirit at birth, and it must be kept pure (T. Naph. 10:8-9). There is no visible evidence of any hypostatization of this spirit as an autonomous personal being.

In rabbinic literature, too, it is hardly possible to systematize the semantics of *rûaḥ*, and especially of the holy spirit. The quasi-dogmatic statement that "the holy spirit ceased"[105] with the destruction of the first temple and that the spirit is expected to return at the eschaton defines the interim as a time of punishment for Israel, which with the loss of the *rûaḥ haqqōḏeš* has lost its "national charisma."[106] The absence of the holy spirit (originally better "the spirit of the sanctuary"), the spirit of the God who reveals himself in the sanctuary, means the end of prophecy (2 Bar. 85:1-3), for the holy spirit is understood as the "mode of God's revelation." The apocalypticists write through the inspiration of the holy spirit (1 En. 91:1; 4 Esd. 5:22), but do so only under

103. Beyer, 183.

104. Kuhn, 117-20.

105. On the place of this statement in the conflict between Judaism and the early church, see Schäfer, *Vorstellung,* 145-46.

106. Schäfer, *Vorstellung*.

the pseudonym of a significant Israelite of the OT period. The rabbis, too, do not think in terms of a personification of the holy spirit in the sense of a "mode of God's being." As the mediator of revelation, this spirit is never also the author of revelation. This is immediately clear from the fact that the rabbis never substitute the holy spirit for God in the classic contexts of God's self-revelation (Sinai, Horeb).

The idea of the "cessation" of the holy spirit was never totally accepted. Especially in mystical circles, there was a clear interest in its continuance. On the one hand, it was thought that the holy spirit that formerly inspired the prophets now inspired certain outstanding rabbis. On the other, the old notion of the holy spirit as a "charisma of office" (associated with Moses, Joshua, Aaron, etc.) was revived and interpreted as an "individual charisma." Thus the holy spirit is accessible to every Israelite and at work in every age (not just at the eschaton).

Finally, the meaning of the expression can blur to the point that it comes to be used as a general term for spiritual excellence (Solomon), strength (Samson), etc. The rabbis are wont to appeal to the holy spirit as an *angelus interpres* when difficult and complex passages of Holy Scripture are to be made transparent. This tendency goes so far that the holy spirit is understood as a "tool" of exegesis for a better understanding of Scripture.

"For the relationship between God and the holy spirit, it is true to say that the holy spirit is neither identical with God when acting as subject nor understood as a hypostasis alongside or subordinate to God. The terms 'holy spirit' and 'God' are never interchangeable or a matter of random choice. On the other hand, when the holy spirit appears as the subject of an act, speaking to a prophet or the like, it is never understood as an autonomous person — rabbinic literature frequently uses personification and dramatization as stylistic devices, but this usage must not be confused with hypostatization in the theological sense. The holy spirit is exclusively a mode of God's revelation."[107]

Besides certain usages of *rûaḥ* in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice (see above), hypostatization of the holy spirit as an autonomous personal medium of divine revelation comparable to the angels is not found until Philo.[108]

Neither do we find evidence for an interpretation of the spirit as a cosmological principle. Only in the context of Hellenism, in conjunction with God's "wisdom," does the speculative horizon broaden.[109]

VIII. Gender. The feminine gender of *rûaḥ* as the creative spirit of God in Gen. 1:2 has led to speculative interpretations of the quickening spirit of God as feminine, to be represented as a mother. One may concur with the view that this text embodies symbolism of divine creativity, but less easily with the identification of a personal sexuality. "The feminine aspect of *ruaḥ,* championing and affirming life, is altogether evident. . . . When the feminine *ruaḥ* was translated into the Greek neuter *pneuma,* the

---

107. Schäfer, "Geist," 174.
108. *Spec. Leg.* 1.65; 4.49; → מלאך *mal'āḵ.*
109. See W. Bieder, "πνεῦμα," *TDNT,* VI, 372-75; Foerster; Maier, *NEB Ergänzungsband 3 zum AT* (1990), 207.

background was suddenly changed — in favor of the realm of feminine experience. And there was certainly a marked shift of emphasis when *pneuma* was translated into the Latin masculine *spiritus*. . . . The repeated change of gender of this term led to a greater loss than appears at first glance."[110]

Fabry

---

110. See H. Schüngel-Straumann, "Ruah [Geist-, Lebenskraft]," in M. Kassel, ed., *Feministische Theologie* (Stuttgart, 1988), 59-73, esp. 70-71; G. Winkler, "Überlegungen zum Gottesgeist als mütterlichem Prinzip und zur Bedeutung der Androgynie in einigen frühchristlichen Quellen," in T. Berger and A. Gerhards, eds., *Liturgie und Frauenfrage. Pietas Liturgica* 7 (St. Ottilien, 1990).

רום *rûm*; מָרוֹם *mārôm*

I. Etymology. II. 1. Distribution; 2. Lexical Field. III. Usage: 1. Qal and Adjective; 2. Niphal; 3. Polel; 4. Hiphil; 5. Nouns. IV. 1. LXX; 2. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Etymology. The root *rûm*, "be high," is well attested in Imperial Aramaic,[1] Biblical Aramaic (peal pass. ptcp., Dnl. 5:20; polel ptcp., 4:34[Eng. 37]; haphel ptcp., 5:19; hithpolel, 5:23; the noun *rûm* in Ezr. 6:3; Dnl. 3:1; 4:7,8,17[10,11,20]), Jewish Aramaic,[2] and in the Aramaic texts from Qumran,[3] as well as in the Tg. In Syriac we find *rûm*,[4] and in Mandaic *RUM*.[5]

---

rûm. Y. Avishur, "*rwm (rmm)* in Ugaritic and in the Bible," *Leš* 45 (1980/81) 270-79; W. Brueggemann, "From Dust to Kingship," *ZAW* 84 (1972) 1-18, esp. 4-5; M. Dahood, "The Composite Divine Name in Psalms 89,16-17 and 140,9," *Bibl* 61 (1980) 277-78; *idem*, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography V," *Bibl* 48 (1967) 421-38, esp. 432; *idem*, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography X," *Bibl* 53 (1972) 386-403, esp. 389-90; O. Eissfeldt, "Hesekiel Kap. 16 als Geschichtsquelle," *JPOS* 16 (1936) 286-92 = *idem*, *KlSchr*, II (1963), 101-6; J. P. Fokkelmann, "תרומת שׂרי in II Sam 1,21a," *ZAW* 91 (1979) 290-92; L. Kopf, "Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch," *VT* 9 (1959) 247-87, esp. 263-64; J. Milgrom, "שוק התרומה, a Chapter in Cultic History," *Tarbiz* 42 (1972/73) 1-11; L. Ruppert, "Erhöhungsvorstellungen im AT," *BZ* 22 (1978) 199-220; H.-P. Stähli, "רום *rûm* hoch sein," *THAT*, II, 753-61; L. Viganò, "Il titolo divino מרום: 'L'Eccèlso,'" *SBFLA* 24 (1974) 188-201.

1. Verb: haphel, *KAI*, 202A.10; 224.5,6; ithpeel, Ahiqar 138; *DISO*, 275-76; noun *(rm)*, *DISO*, 280.

2. *DISO*, 276; Beyer, 695.

3. 5Q15 fr. 1, 1:13; 2:5,12.

4. *LexSyr*, 720.

5. *MdD*, 430.

The root is common in Ugaritic.[6] It occurs as a verb,[7] in the nouns *mrym*[8] and *trmmt,*[9] and in the adj. *rm (nmm rmm).*[10] It also occurs in personal names.[11] The root occurs as a noun *(mrm)* in a Punic inscription[12] and in Phoenician *(rm).*[13]

The root also appears in personal names in Amorite,[14] Phoenician,[15] and Palmyrene.[16] In regard to the divine name *Samēmroumos,*[17] cf. Palmyr. *rm-š'* (short form of *rm-šmš*[18]).

Attestation in South Semitic is marginal or nonexistent. The Ethiopic cognate is found only in the foreign PN *rāmā* and in the term for the "third heaven," probably also a loanword. In Epigraphic South Arabic, *rm* occurs as an element of a few personal names (e.g., Sab. *'lrm*[19]), but it is uncertain whether the root in question is actually *rwm.* Harding assumes the root *rmm* in each instance.[20] In Old South Arabic, *rym* means "lift, set up" or "take away"; as a noun it means "height, top." It may also have the meaning "praise."[21] Arab. *rāma* has the meaning "go away, leave the spot."[22]

II. 1. *Distribution.* There are 166 occurrences of the verb: 41 in the qal (primarily in poetic texts), 4 of the niphal, 25 of the polel (likewise frequent in poetry), 3 of the polal, 2 of the hithpael (including Isa. 33:10 *Q*), 88 of the hiphil, and 3 of the hophal. The participle occurs 28 times. The nouns are distributed as follows: *rûm* (actually the infinitive[23]), 6 occurrences; *rôm,* Hab. 3:10; *rāmâ* (cf. *bāmâ*), Ezk. 16:24,25,31,39; *rāmûṯ,* Ezk. 32:5; *rômām,* Ps. 66:17(?); 149:6; *rômēmûṯ,* Isa. 33:3; *mārôm* (a *maqṭāl* form[24]), 54 occurrences, mostly in poetry; → תרומה *t^erûmâ,* 76 occurrences, in P, Ezekiel, and late texts; *t^erûmîyâ,* Ezk. 48:12. Finally, the adj. *rômâ* occurs in Mic. 2:3.[25]

---

6. *UT,* no. 2311; *WUS,* no. 2514.
7. *KTU,* 1.4, V, 52; 1.13, 12; 1.13, 32.
8. *KTU,* 1.3, IV, 38; 1.4, IV, 19; V, 23; 1.5, I, 11.
9. *KTU,* 1.6, VI, 44.
10. *KTU,* 1.108, 7.
11. *PNU,* 182-83; on the PNs in the Hatra inscriptions see S. Abbadi, *Die Personennamen der Inschriften aus Hatra* (Hildesheim, 1983), 49, 164.
12. *DISO,* 168.
13. *DISO,* 280.
14. *APNM,* 261-63, contra von Soden, who derives these names from *riāmu/râmu* III, "give"; see *AHw,* II, 952b, 986-87; see also *Bibel und Alter Orient. BZAW* 162 (1985), 129ff.
15. Benz, 408-9.
16. *PNPI,* 112.
17. Sanchuniaton, 34d; cf. *ESE,* II, 52ff.
18. *PNPI,* 112.
19. *CIH,* 397.1; cf. ContiRossini, 241.
20. G. L. Harding, *An Index and Concordance of the Pre-Islamic Arabian Names and Inscriptions* (Toronto, 1971), 286, 915.
21. ContiRossini, 240-41; Beeston, 120; Biella, 487-88.
22. Wehr, 371-72.
23. *BLe,* §61t.
24. *BLe,* §61gζ.
25. *GK,* §118q.

The distribution of occurrences among and within the books of the OT shows clearly that the root appears primarily in elevated and metrical language of poetry, difficult to categorize by historical literary analysis; only relatively late (i.e., in the exilic and postexilic period) was it incorporated very sporadically in prose and narrative contexts, usually as a participle (Gen. 7:17b [R^P]; 14:22; Ex. 14:8,16 [P]; Nu. 15:30; 17:10[16:45; see below]; 20:11; 33:3; Dt. 1:28; 2:10,21; 27:14; 1 Ch. 15:16; Ezk. 10:4). This observation does not hold true for the hiphil with its wide range of meanings, which is already found in the preexilic period in both poetic and narrative (e.g., JE) contexts.[26]

The root appears also as an element in a series of Israelite personal names (Abram, Joram, Adoniram, etc.)[27] and toponyms (Merom, Josh. 11:5,7; Ramah, Josh. 18:25; 19:29,36; etc.).

2. *Lexical Field.* The wide range of meanings that *rûm* encompasses is reflected in a long list of synonyms: in the qal, → נשׂא *nś'* niphal and → קום *qûm;* with the meaning "pride," primarily → גאה *g'h* and → גבה *gbh;* in the polel, in the context of "raise, help," → עשׂה *'śh, ḥayil,* → פלט *plṭ* piel, and → יצא *yṣ'* hiphil; in hymnic invocations, → ברך *brk* piel, *nwh* hiphil, → ידה *ydh* II hiphil, and → הלל *hll* piel; in other contexts also → גדל *gdl* piel, → עמד *'md* hiphil, and → סלל *sll* pilpel; in the hithpolel, → גדל *gādhal* hithpael, "boast" (Dnl. 11:36); in the hiphil, finally, → נשׂא *nś'* and → קום *qûm* hiphil; in sacrificial texts esp. → נוף *nwp* hiphil; and in further contexts → בנה *bnh* and → לקח *lqḥ.*

III. Usage.

1. *Qal and Adjective.* The qal of *rûm* appears primarily in poetic texts (see above). As functional equivalents, we find the verb *gāḇah* and its derived adj. *gāḇōah,* less often the adjs. *gāḏôl* and *'elyôn.* In descriptive contexts the qal can appear with a great variety of objects: stars (Job 22:12), mountains (Dt. 12:2), hills (*giḇ'â,* Ezk. 6:13), trees (Isa. 2:13), persons (Dt. 1:28), etc.

It is used to qualify God as great, exalted, and mighty, ruling over the nations (Ps. 99:2; 113:4; cf. 46:11[10]: over the nations and the earth). The exalted God dwells in the heavens; God's *kāḇôḏ* fills the earth (57:6,12[5,11]) or is higher than the heavens (113:4). But this exalted God, seated on high *(gbh),* looks far down (113:5-6), sees what is low *(šāpāl)* and knows "what is high" *(gāḇōah)* — probably human arrogance. In this regard Isa. 57:15 is particularly instructive: God, who is high and lofty (*rām wᵉniśśā';* cf. 6:1), dwells in the heights *(mārôm)* but also with the battered *(dakkā')* and oppressed *(šᵉpal rûaḥ).* Ps. 18:47(46) par. 2 S. 22:47 presents a hymnic jussive: "Exalted be the God of my salvation." In Isa. 2:17, however, where the exaltation of God is manifested in the humbling *(šḥḥ, špl)* of human arrogance *(gaḇhûṯ, rûm), niśgaḇ* is used of God.

26. See III.4 below.
27. *IPN,* 52, 145-46, 201.

The servant (*'eḇeḏ*[28]) of Yahweh, too, will be "exalted and lifted up" (*yārûm wᵉniśśā',* Isa. 52:13; cf. the discussion of 57:15 above); here this statement refers to restoration and honor.

The pl. *rāmîm* in Job 21:22 probably refers to heavenly beings, who are subject to God's judgment.

The Hebrew idiom *bᵉyāḏ rāmâ,* "with raised hand, high-handedly," describes the actions of someone who brazenly transgresses the law (Nu. 15:30). But it can also be a sign of triumph, as when the people depart from Egypt "with raised hands" (NRSV "boldly"; Ex. 14:8 P; Nu. 33:3). In a similar vein the mighty acts of the God of Israel are performed "with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm" (Dt. 4:34; 5:15; 26:8).

This metaphor probably originates in representations of ancient Near Eastern deities with their right hand raised or stretched out, holding a spear, battle-ax, or lightning bolt.[29] The raised hand signals readiness for battle; it is a threatening gesture of the deity against the enemy or even of a mortal against God.[30] This image precisely describes the brazen sinner who acts in open (Tg. *bᵉrêš gᵉlê,* "public") disobedience to the Lord (cf. Job 38:15). Dt. 32:27 shows the connection between a false self-confidence and contempt for God. In the theology of P, willful sins can be forgiven or expiated by sacrifice only if the sinner has confessed and repented of the transgression.[31] Repentance transforms the sin into an inadvertent offense, for which a sacrifice makes satisfaction.

Thus the phrase *bᵉyāḏ rāmâ* belongs to a group of idioms that express arrogance and contempt, such as *'ênayim rāmôṯ* (Ps. 18:28[27]; Prov. 6:17), *rûm 'ênayim* (Isa. 10:12; Prov. 21:4), *rûm lēḇ* (Jer. 48:29), and similar combinations with *gbh.*

2. *Niphal.* The niphal (actually *rmm*) is found only in very late texts. Ezk. 10:15, 17,19 describe the rising of the cherubim (v. 19, *min-hā'āreṣ*); in Nu. 17:10(16:45) Moses and Aaron are told to "get away" so that Yahweh can destroy the congregation (postexilic; cf. 16:21, *bdl* niphal).[32]

3. *Polel.* The basic meaning of the polel is "raise, exalt," both in the figurative sense when applied to persons and in the sense of "praise, extol." In the first instance it is restricted to the language of prayer and worship. Yahweh exalts the worshiper (1 S. 2:7; 2 S. 22:49 par. Ps. 18:49[48]; Ps. 37:34), lifts the psalmist up from the gates of death (9:14[13]) and sets him high on a rock (27:5). In proverbial wisdom, righteousness (Prov. 14:34) and wisdom (4:8) are described as exalting. Praise is always directed to God or God's name (Ex. 15:2; Isa. 25:1; Ps. 30:2[1]; 34:4[3]; 99:5,9; 107:32; 118:28; 145:1). Here we also include the noun *rômām,* "hymn of praise" (clearly attested only

---

28. → עבד *'āḇaḏ.*

29. *ANEP,* nos. 466, 480-84, 490-97; cf. C. J. Labuschagne, *Von Kanaan bis Kerala. FS J. P. M. van der Ploeg. AOAT* 211 (1982), 143-48.

30. D. Kellermann, *Wort und Geschichte. FS K. Elliger. AOAT* 18 (1973), 107-13.

31. J. Milgrom, *RB* 82 (1975) 187-205.

32. E. Aurelius, *Das Fürbitter Israels. CBOT* 27 (1988), 198-200.

in Ps. 149:6; cf. NRSV "high praise"), which the faithful have in their throats. On occasion, the polel of *rûm* can mean "raise" in the sense of "bring up" (children, Isa. 1:2; 23:4; cf. 2 K. 10:6) or "cause to grow" (a tree, Ezk. 31:4, par. *giddēl*), or even "(re)build" (the temple, Ezr. 9:9, par. *'md* hiphil).

4. *Hiphil.* a. *Basic Meanings.* (1) The primary meaning of the hiphil is "lift up, raise." Used in this sense, as well as in senses (3) and (5) below, the verb is roughly a synonym of *nāśā'* and an antonym of *hišpîl.* It appears with the following objects, always syntactic accusatives (*bᵉ* as a mark of the direct object occurs only in the late text 1 Ch. 15:16 [*lᵉhārîm bᵉqôl*] and in the Dead Sea Scrolls]): staff (*maṭṭeh,* Ex. 14:16; cf. Isa. 10:15), head (raising one's own head as a sign of victory, Ps. 110:7; raising the head of another with the same meaning, Ps. 3:4[3]), hand (one's own hand, Gen. 41:44; Ex. 17:11; Nu. 20:11; the right hand of another, to lend support, Ps. 89:43[42]; one hand as an oath before *'ēl 'elyôn:* Gen. 14:22 [= *nāśā' yād,* Ex. 6:8 P; Nu. 14:30 P; Dt. 32:40; Ezk. 20:5,6,15,23,28,42; 36:7; 47:14]; both hands to swear: Dnl. 12:7; *bᵉ*, "against someone," 1 K. 11:26,27), foot (Gen. 41:44; Ps. 74:3), and face (*'el yhwh* in prayer: Ezr. 9:6). Eyes (*'ênayim*) are never the object of *hērîm.* In the expression "lift up one's eyes" (i.e., look up), we find instead the synonym *nāśā'* (e.g., Gen. 31:10; Ezk. 18:6,15; Ps. 121:1; 123:1).[33]

"Raise one's voice" means "call out loudly" (Gen. 39:15,18) or "speak out" (2 K. 19:22, with *'al,* "against"; cf. *ḥērēp̱* and *giddēp̱*), "summon" (Isa. 13:2 [with *lᵉ* + personal pronoun]; 40:9; 58:1; Job 38:34 [with *lā'aḇ*]), "cry out" (Ezk. 21:27[22] [in battle]; Ezr. 3:12; 2 Ch. 5:13 [with joy]).

The raising up of the poor in 1 S. 2:8 and Ps. 113:7 includes not only pulling them "out of the dust" but also heightening their esteem in the eyes of others.

(2) In some cases the hiphil takes on the reflexive meaning "pick up for oneself, take" (Nu. 17:2[16:37] [cf. *wayyiqqaḥ* in 17:4(16:39)]; 2 K. 2:13); this meaning can be emphasized by use of the prep. *lᵉ* with a suffix referring to the subject (Josh. 4:5 [JE]; 2 K. 6:7 [echoed by *wayyiqqāḥēhû*]). It is easy to see how this reflexive meaning could develop into "take away, remove."[34] The verb *nāśā'* occurs with a similar meaning (Nu. 16:15; Jgs. 21:23; Jer. 49:29; Mic. 2:2; 1 Ch. 18:11; 21:24; 27:23), especially in the idiom *nāśā' 'āwōn,* "forgive" — i.e., take away someone's guilt.

(3) The verb has the meaning "set up" when used with the obj. *maṣṣēḇâ* (Gen. 31:45; *bānâ* can be used with the same meaning) or *nēs* (Isa. 49:22 par. *nāśā'*; 62:10).

(4) The meaning "build on high" appears only in Isa. 14:13 (a throne) and Job 39:27 (an eagle's nest).

(5) The "raising" or "exaltation" of persons (Ps. 3:4[3]; 89:20[19]) can also be expressed by the hiphil of *rwm;* cf. the use of the qal par. *nāśā'* niphal in this sense (Isa. 52:13; 57:15). According to 1 K. 14:7, Jeroboam was exalted to *nāgîḏ* in the midst of his people (*hᵃrîmōṯîḵā mittôḵ hā'ām*); 1 K. 16:2 says much the same of Jehu.

---

33. On *rûm* in combination with *'ênayim* see III.1 above.

34. See III.4.b below.

An idiomatic use of the verb to convey this meaning employs "horn"[35] as the direct object (1 S. 2:10; Ps. 89:18[17] [*K; Q* reads qal]; 92:11[10]; 148:14; Lam. 2:17; cf. also *nōśᵉʾîm qeren* in Zec. 2:4). A possible basis for this idiom may lie in the image of a bull raising its head high, an image primarily expressing strength. The similar idiom *hiṣmîaḥ qeren* (Ezk. 29:21 [cf. Ps. 148:14]; Ps. 132:17) and the antonymous idiom *gāḏaʿ/giddaʿ qeren* (Ps. 75:11[10], antonymous to *tᵉrômamnâ qarnôṯ ṣaddîq;* Lam. 2:3) show that the horn indicates an adult animal, which has reached the peak of its strength. Without its horn, however, it is defenseless (cf. also Jer. 48:25: *nigdᵉʿâ qeren* par. *zᵉrōʿô nišbārâ;* Zec. 2:4[1:21]). The raised horn is thus particularly symbolic of destructive power (cf. Dt. 33:17; 1 K. 22:11; Mic. 4:13; Ps. 22:22[21]). This holds true also for the idiom *hērîm qeren,* as the parallels *yittēn ʿōz* (1 S. 2:10) and *tip̱ʾereṯ ʿuzzāmô ʾattâ* (Ps. 89:18[17]) attest. Similarly, just as the horn indicates animal power, the hand represents human strength (cf. *yāḏ rāmâ*[36]).

b. *"Take Away."* The meaning "lift, take,"[37] gave rise to the meaning "take away" (= *hēsîr*[38]) (*ʾazkārâ,* Lev. 2:9; *ḥeleḇ,* Lev. 4:8,19; *bᵉqumṣô,* Lev. 6:8[15]; *ʿᵃṭārâ,* Ezk. 21:31, par. *hēsîr; tāmîḏ,* Dnl. 8:11 [hophal]), leading eventually to the meaning "remove" (Ezk. 45:9).

c. *Cultic Usage.* As a regular cultic term for the *tᵉrûmâ* offering,[39] *hērîm* means "present, set apart" (e.g., Ex. 35:24; Nu. 15:20; 18:19,24,26,28,29; 31:28 [cf. v. 29b]; 31:52; Ezk. 45:1,13; 48:8,9,20). The usage of P associates the verb with the *tᵉrûmâ,* just as it associates *heʿᵉlâ* with the *ʿōlâ, zāḇaḥ* with the *zeḇaḥ* (H; P prefers *hiqrîḇ*), and *hēnîp̱* with the *tᵉnûp̱â.*

The verbs *hērîm* and *hēnîp̱*[40] with their associated nouns *tᵉrûmâ* and *tᵉnûp̱â* are often confused. Only P distinguished between *hērîm* and *hēnîp̱,* which elsewhere appear in parallel (Isa. 10:15b; 13:2). While *hēnîp̱* continues to denote the physical act of elevation, *hērîm* is used only in the derived meanings "set apart" and "present," which originated as described above. This difference is underlined by the associated terminology: while *tᵉrûmâ* is set apart "for Yahweh" without an accompanying rite in the sanctuary, *tᵉnûp̱â* is performed "before Yahweh," i.e., in the sanctuary; it therefore signalizes a ritual consecration (of freewill offerings). The *tᵉnûp̱â* rite consists in elevating the sacrificial offering with both hands before the altar (Ex. 29:24).[41]

5. *Nouns.* The noun *rûm* (except in Prov. 25:3: "The heavens so high, the earth so deep . . . who can search it out?") conveys the semantic element of arrogance: on the day of Yahweh the proud and arrogant must humble themselves; God will punish the king of As-

35. → קרן *qeren.*
36. See III.1 above.
37. See III.4.a.(2) above.
38. → סור *sûr.*
39. → תרומה *tᵉrûmâ.*
40. → נוף *nûp̱.*
41. J. Milgrom, *IEJ* 22 (1972) 33-38; *idem, Zer li-geburot. FS Z. Shazar* (Jerusalem, 1973), 93-110 [Heb.].

syria on account of his *tip'eret rûm 'ênāyw* (Isa. 10:12 par. *p^e^rî-gōdēl l^e^bab;* cf. Prov. 21:4: *rûm-'ênayim* par. *r^e^ḥab-lēb*), and reproves the pride of Moab (*rum libbô,* Jer. 48:29).

In 2 K. 19:22 par. Isa. 37:23; Ps. 56:3(2), *mārôm* means "haughtiness"; in Ps. 73:8; 75:6(5), it means "overbearing"; in Jer. 17:12; Ps. 92:9(8), "loftiness"; and in Job 5:11; Eccl. 10:6, "high social status." Everywhere else, in contrast to *rûm,* it denotes primarily spatial or topographical elevation (Isa. 26:5; 33:16; Hab. 2:9; Job 39:18); it can even become a technical term for the heavens. For example, the citadel, the highest point in the city, is called *m^e^rōmê qāreṯ* (Prov. 9:3,14; cf. *rō'š m^e^rômîm* in 8:2); the heights of mountains or mountain ranges can be referred to with *mārôm* as *nomen regens* (2 K. 19:23; Isa. 37:24 [twice]; Jer. 49:16; Ob. 3; cf. also Jgs. 5:18). The "mountain height of Israel," of course, is Zion (Ezk. 17:23; 20:40; 34:14; cf. Jer. 31:12: *bimrôm-ṣîyôn*).

Only rarely is *mārôm* in the sense of "(heights of) heaven" associated directly with Yahweh (Isa. 24:4,18; Jer. 51:53, with reference to Babylon). The *mārôm* is the place where Yahweh dwells (Isa. 33:5; 57:15); from there he looks down (Ps. 102:20[19]) to deliver the prisoners and those condemned to death, and intervenes to help (2 S. 22:17 par. Ps. 18:17[16]; Ps. 144:7, in independent descriptions of a theophany[42]); but there he also sits enthroned as judge (Ps. 7:8[7] [cf. v. 7(6)]; Isa. 24:21); thence he sends his judgment on the nations and on Jerusalem (Jer. 25:30; Lam. 1:13).

To the *mārôm* people lift their eyes (Isa. 38:14; 40:26) and their voices (which remain unheard: 58:4). Job invokes God on high as a witness (*śāh^a^dî bamm^e^rômîm* par. *baššāmayim 'ēḏî,* Job 16:19) and hopes to receive from God above *ḥēleq w^e^naḥ^a^lâ* on account of his innocence. Mic. 6:6 asks how anyone could possibly come before God on high if even the greatest and most precious offerings are deemed insufficient. The age of salvation for human beings and the natural world will dawn when the spirit from on high is poured out (Isa. 32:15).

IV. 1. *LXX.* The LXX uses a great variety of words to translate *rûm* and its derivatives:

Qal: *apaírein* (Ezk. 10:4), *dynatṓteron* (Dt. 1:28; 2:21), *ekzeín* (Ex. 16:20), *eumḗkēs* (Dt. 9:2), *échein* (Prov. 30:13), *ischýein* (Dt. 2:10 [ptcp.]), *meteōrízein* (3 times: Ps. 130[131]:1, etc.), *metéōros* (2 S. 22:28), *hýbris* (Isa. 2:17), *hybristḗs* (Prov. 6:17), *hyperḗphanos* (Job 38:15; Ps. 17[18]:28[27]; Isa. 2:12), *hyperypsoún* (Dnl. 11:12), *hypsēlós* (13 times: Ex. 14:8; Nu. 33:3; Dt. 12:2; etc.), *hýpsistos* (Isa. 57:15).

Niphal: *enchōreín* (Nu. 16:45[17:10], *epaírein* (Ex. 7:20), *aírein* (Ezk. 10:15).

Polel: *anypsoún* (1 S. 2:7), *doxázein* (Isa. 25:1; 33:10?[43]), *hypsoún* (23 times: Ex. 15:2, etc.).

Hithpolel: *hypsóō* (Dnl. 11:36).[43]

Hiphil: *aírein* (3 times: Isa. 10:15, etc.), *anaireín* (Nu. 16:37[17:2]; Josh. 4:5), *anypsoún* (Ps. 112[113]:7), *apárchesthai* (2 Ch. 30:24; 35:7,9), *aphaireín* (15 times:

42. J. Jeremias, *Theophanie. WMANT* 10 (^{2}1977), 128-29.

43. On *'ērômām* in Isa. 33:10 (?) see H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 2002), 279.

Ex. 35:24, etc.), *aphorízein* (5 times: Nu. 15:20, etc.), *didónai* (2 Ch. 35:8), *egeírein* (1 S. 2:8), *ekteínein* (Gen. 14:22), *exaírein* (Gen. 41:44; Isa. 62:10; Ezk. 45:9), *epitithénai* (Ezk. 21:26[31]?), *hépsein* (1 S. 9:24), *istánai* (Gen. 31:45), *ischyrṓs* (Prov. 14:29), *kaleín* (Job 38:34), *periaireín* (Lev. 4:8,19), *aphaireín* (Lev. 22:15), *tithénai* (Isa. 14:13), *hýpsos* (1 Ch. 15:16), *hypsoún* (31 times: Gen. 39:15, etc.).

Hophal: *exaírein* (Dnl. 8:11?), *aphaireín* (Ex. 29:27; Lev. 4:10).

mārôm: antanaireín (Ps. 9:26[10:5]), *kraugḗ* (Job 16:19? Isa. 58:4?), *meteṓros* (Ezk. 17:23), *óros* (Jer. 38[31]:12), *ouranós* (Isa. 24:18,21), *hypsēlós* (12 times: Ps. 92[93]:4; Prov. 8:2; etc.), *hýpsistos* (8 times: Ps. 70[71]:19, etc.), *hýpsos* (24 times: Jgs. 5:18; 2 S. 22:17; etc.), *hypsoún* (Ob. 3; Jer. 17:12).

rûm: megalóphrōn (Prov. 21:4), *hýbris* (Isa. 2:17 [LXX^{B}]), *hypsēlós* (Prov. 25:3), *hýpsos* (Isa. 2:11,17; 10:12), *hypsoún* (Jer. 31[48]:29).

Other nouns: *rāmâ: básis* (Ezk. 16:31,39), *porneía* (Ezk. 16:25); *rāmîṯ: haíma* (thus read Heb. *dām*); *rômām: hypsoún* (Ps. 65[66]:17), *hýpsōsis* (Ps. 149:6); *rômᵉmûṯ: phóbos* (Isa. 33:3).

Firmage/Milgrom/Dahmen

2. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* The root *rwm* occurs more than 200 times in the Dead Sea Scrolls (plus 16 occurrences of → תרומה *tᵉrûmâ*). These occurrences are concentrated in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice (78), 1/4QM (26, of which 16 occur in 1QM 14 par.), 1QH (25), 1QS (9), CD (7) and 4Q511 (6). Usage reflects that of the OT, although the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice exhibit their own peculiar tendency.[44]

a. *Qal.* There are 30 occurrences of the root in the qal (including the verbal adj.), plus 5 in fragments. No one who enters the community shall "move up from the place of his lot" (1QS 2:23). The idiom *byd rmh* characterizes the flagrant transgressions of the wicked (1QS 5:12; CD 8:8; 19:21) and the man of lies (*'yš hkzb*, 4QpPs37 4:14-15, interpreting Ps. 37:35-36); in regulations governing the community, it refers to "deliberate" transgressions (antonym: *šgg*, "inadvertent": 1QS 8:17,22; 9:1; CD 10:3). Pride and arrogance are censured by 1QS 11:1 *(rmy rwḥ);* 1QpHab 8:10 (*rm lbw;* cf. 11QT 57:14: *wlw' yrwm lbbw* in the codicils to the law governing kings; 1Q22 2:4: *yrwm lbbkh;* cf. also the nominal phrase *rwm lbb* in 1QS 4:9; also Lk. 1:51); possibly also 1QM 14:11 par. 4QM^{a} frs. 8-10, 1:8: *wrmy qwmh,* "those grew high" (= [?] the powerful; on the context cf. Lk. 1:52). Finally, Yahweh is called on to rise up and intervene on behalf of those who call on him (1QM 12:18; with exhortative 1QM 14:16 par. 4QM^{a} frs. 8-10, 1:13; 4Q381 fr. 33, 2). In 11Q5 (11QPs^{a}) 22:14, Zion is called upon to rise up and open wide her gates.

b. *Niphal.* The only clear niphal of *rwm/rmm* occurs in 1QH 8:9, which describes the trees by the water as rising. The interpretation of *bhrwmm* in 4Q405 frs. 20-22, 7,12; 11Q17 (11QShirShab) is disputed.[45]

c. *Polel.* There are 24 occurrences of the polel, plus 5 in fragmentary contexts; the meaning is probably always "exalt, praise." In 1QH 11:15 (uniquely in 1QH), the

44. See IV.2.c below.

45. C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice. HSS* 27 (1985), *in loc.*

thanksgiving hymn begins with a double invocation of God: *'wdkh 'ly 'rwmmkh ṣwry.* On the day after victory, the sons of light are to present themselves at the place where battle was joined and "praise the God of Israel and exalt his name *(wrwmmw šmw)* in joyous communion" (1QM 14:4); conscious of God's help, "for your mighty deeds we extol *(nrwmmh)* your splendor at all times" (l. 13 par. 4QMª frs. 8-10, 1:10).

The polel (together with the occurrences of *rômām,* "praise") represents the first concentration of the root *rwm* in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice. The object of the praise is always God, expressed directly (4Q400 fr. 2, 8), by a suffix (4Q403 fr. 1, 22:20; 405 frs. 8-9, 4 par. 11Q17 frs. 3-4, 9), or by a divine epithet (e.g., *kbdw,* 4Q400 fr. 1, 2:13; 400 fr. 2, 3; MasShirShab 1:10). The usage of *rômām* is analogous (4Q403 fr. 1, 1:1 par. MasShirShab 2:8: *rwmm l'lwhy ml'ky rwm;* 4Q403 fr. 1, 2:25: *tšbḥwt rwmm lmlk hkbwd;* MasShirShab 2:7: *rwmm 'mtw lmlk ml'kym*).

Besides descriptive passages (4Q400 fr. 1, 2:13), the polel of *rwm* appears in calls to praise within the context of human society (4Q400 fr. 2, 8). In the introductions to individual songs, the "initial call to praise" *(hllw)* is usually followed by at least a further call to exalt;[46] thus *rwm* appears as a second element at the beginning of the songs for the eighth sabbath (4Q403 fr. 1, 2:20 par. 405 frs. 8-9, 4) and the twelfth sabbath (4Q405 frs. 20-22, 7 par. 11Q17 frs. 3-4, 9). In the song for the (central) seventh sabbath, *rwm* introduces the fourth call to praise (4Q403 fr. 1, 1:33), which is structured on this root as a catchword (alliteration and wordplay with the root's semantic variety).[47] The vocabulary of the eighth sabbath song (403 fr. 1, 2:20 par.) suggests to Newsom that praise functions as a substitute for sacrifice; the songs of praise become offerings ("elevation offering of the lips") (cf. also 4Q403 fr. 1, 1:39-40).[48] This observation poses the central question of the function of these songs: are we dealing "only" with a "description" of the liturgy or with a "staging" of the heavenly liturgy?[49] The artful structure of the songs does not preclude their liturgical use; at Qumran this might be quite deliberate, since the community could not take part in the cult of the Jerusalem temple. Finally, God is referred to twice as *mlk mrwmmym,* "king of those who praise (God)" (4Q403 fr. 3, 1; 405 frs. 14-15, 1:3).

d. *Hithpolel.* The hithpolel occurs three times (1QH 2:28; 10:25; 1QH fr. 8, 3). Drawing on images from the natural realm, the hymnodist compares the temptations that beset him to waves that heave upward *(bhtrwmm glyhm),* making "delusion and deception mount to the stars" (1QH 2:27-28). He thanks God that he is not like those who rely on worldly goods and "take pride in their belongings and possessions" (*wytrwmmw bmqnh qqnyw,* 1QH 10:25).

e. *Hiphil.* There are 32 occurrences of the hiphil, plus 4 in fragments. Its usage continues to display the variety found in the OT:

"Raise one's hand." One may lift one's own hand (1QS 10:15), to hold a weapon

46. *Ibid.,* 171.
47. *Ibid.,* 216-17.
48. *Ibid.,* 239.
49. See, respectively, H. Stegemann, *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde* (Bonn, 1971), and J. Maier, *Vom Kultus zur Gnosis* (Salzburg, 1964).

(1QM 16:6; 17:12 par. 4QM[a] fr. 11, 2:5,21; 1QM 13:5) or to strike a domestic animal with one's fist (CD 11:6). One may also raise one's hand against God's holy laws (CD 20:30). "The God of Israel is raising his hand with his marvelous power" (1QM 15:13).

In 4Q184 fr. 1, 13-14 the reader is warned against the "wiles of the wicked woman" (the title of the text), who raises her eyebrows impudently *(w'p'pyh bpḥz trym)* to lead the righteous man astray and to trip up the strong man.

"Raise one's voice." The beset Teacher of Righteousness finds it impossible to raise his voice (1QH 8:35). The people are to respond *('nh)* and lift up their voices and speak (4QM[a] fr. 13, 8). The author of 4Q511 fr. 63, 3:5 is to announce peace to all the men of the covenant and to raise a terrifying shout: Woe to all who break it.

"Set up." The object may be a signal staff *(trn,* 1QH 6:23 par. *nś' ns)* or dominion *(mśrh/mmšlh,* 1QM 17:7).

"Lift up." God has lifted up the despairing heart (1QM 14:5 par. 4QM[a] frs. 8-10, 1:3) and will raise from the dust (1QM 14:14 par. 4QM[a] frs. 8-10, 1:12). Again we find the idiomatic usage with *qeren* (1QH 7:22,23). The holy ones of God will be lifted up by God's judgment (11Q13 [11QMelch] 2:9; cf. also 1QH 6:8; 7:16; 4Q381 fr. 33, 10). The words "from flesh you have raised his [the just man's; cf. l. 15] glory" in 1QH 15:16-17 should be understood eschatologically in the sense of a new creation: the crucial turning point for the faithful man is seen as his entrance into the community.[50] Lichtenberger thinks rather in terms of predestination: by God's action the just individual is removed from the rest of humanity, and to him is already given the eschatological *kbwd,* a share in salvation.[51]

As a cultic term, the hiphil of *rwm* appears in 11QT 20:14 in the context of the festival of new wine and in CD 6:20 in the admonition to "offer the holy offerings according to their precise regulations."

f. *rwm.* Only in 1QS 4:9 and 4Q184 fr. 2, 5,6 does the noun *rwm* have its OT meaning "arrogance." Elsewhere, in the major documents, it already denotes spatial or abstract "height" and is linked with physical or abstract concepts: tall waves (1QH 3:15), high slopes (1QH 3:29), supreme pleasures (1QH 10:30), the height of cedars (CD 2:19). In 1QS 10:12 *rwm kbwd* is a divine epithet, as is *rwm gwdlw* in 1QM 1:8.

In the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice the noun represents the second and most important concentration of the root. Besides serving as a term for God's dominion (*rwm mlkwtw/mlkwtkh:* 4Q400 fr. 1, 2:1; 4Q403 fr. 1, 1:8,14 par.) and describing the heavenly beings (*ml'ky rwm:* 4Q403 fr. 1, 1:1; *rwmy d't:* 4Q403 fr. 1, 1:14 par.), *rwm* is used like *mārôm* as a technical term for the heavens,[52] a usage already found in 1QH 3:20; 1QSb 5:23;[53] 4Q511 fr. 10, 12; fr. 41, 1.

g. *mārôm.* Except in 4QpPs37 3:11 (where, in an interpretation of Ps. 37:21-22, the "community of the poor" is promised that they will "possess the high mountain of Is-

50. H.-W. Kuhn, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil. SUNT* 4 (1966), 110-11.

51. H. Lichtenberger, *Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Qumrangemeinde. SUNT* 15 (1980), 225.

52. See IV.2.g below.

53. Kuhn, *Enderwartung,* 54-57.

rael [=Zion] and delight in its sanctuary"), the noun *mārôm* always means "the heavens" (cf. 1QM 14:14; 17:8; 1QH 10:32). In the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice it is used both absolutely (4Q400 fr. 1, 2:2; 4Q401 fr. 23, 2; etc.) and in construct phrases with both *rw'š* (4Q403 fr. 1, 1:34,43 par.) and *rwm* (4Q400 fr. 1, 1:20; 2:4; fr. 2, 4; 4Q403 fr. 1, 1:34 par.; MasShirShab 1:9; cf. also *rwm rwmym:* 4Q403 fr. 1, 1:41 par.; MasShir Shab 1:9). Along with *šmy mlkwtw,* these are the only terms that refer to the heavens in general.

Dahmen

רוע *rw';* תְּרוּעָה *t^erû'â;* רֵעַ *rēa'*

I. Etymology, Occurrences. II. Usage: 1. General; 2. War Cry; 3. Shouts of Joy; 4. Cultic Shouts. III. LXX. IV. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Etymology, Occurrences. The root *rw'* is found only in Hebrew (including Middle Hebrew). It is possibly related to Arab. *rağā,* "shout" (Kopf: *rw',* "evoke a surge of emotion," is dubious).

The verb occurs 40 times in the hiphil, once in the polel, and 3 times in the hithpolel. The noun *t^erû'â* occurs 36 times, *rēa'* 3 times. The former appears frequently as the cognate object of the verb. The occurrence in the Aramaic "Fasting Scroll" (*t^erû'aṯ maṭrā',* "sounding of the horn for rain") is undoubtedly a Hebrew loanword.[1]

II. Usage. The basic meaning of the root appears to be "shout."[2] A shout can be raised for a variety of reasons and in a variety of circumstances, above all as a shout of rejoicing or a war cry. The lexical field therefore includes *rnn, śmḥ, gîl* as well as *milḥāmâ;* in either case the shout can be accompanied by *šôp̱ār* or *ḥ^aṣōṣ^erôṯ.* The verb and nouns are associated so closely that separate treatment is unnecessary.

1. *General.* A shout of derision appears in Job 30:5, which speaks of those who are driven out of society: "People shout after them as after a thief." In Isa. 15:4 (if the text

rw'. R. Bach, *Die Aufforderungen zur Flucht und zum Kampf im alttestamentlichen Prophetenspruch. WMANT* 9 (1962); G. D. Cova, "Popolo e vittoria," *Bibl* 66 (1985) 221-40; F. C. Fensham, "New Light from Ugaritica V on Ex. 32:17," *JNSL* 2 (1972) 86-87; P. Humbert, *La* "terou'a", *analyse d'un rite biblique* (Neuchâtel, 1946); Ihromi, "Die Häufung der Verben des Jubelns in Zephanja III 14f.,16-18," *VT* 33 (1983) 106-10; L. Köhler, "Archäologisches," *ZAW* 34 (1914) 146-49, esp. 147; L. Kopf, "Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch," *VT* 8 (1958) 161-215, esp. 203-5; R. Schmid, "Opfer mit Jubel," *TZ* 35 (1979) 48-54.

1. Beyer, 358, l. 28.
2. *GesB,* 751.

is correct[3]), the meaning "cry of lamentation" seems appropriate: the cities of Moab lament *(zāʿaq),* and its armed men *(ḥᵃlûṣîm)* cry out. The situation is similar in Jer. 20:16; since this text contains an allusion to Sodom and Gomorrah, *tᵉrûʿâ* as a parallel to *zᵉʿāqâ,* "cry for help," can hardly be translated "noise of war." In Mic. 4:9, too, we appear to be dealing with a cry of lament: the city of Zion cries aloud *(hērîaʿ rēaʿ)* as though she has no king — normally a king is hailed with *tᵉrûʿâ.* A cry of a quite different sort is raised (Jgs. 7:21) by the Midianites when they flee their camp in panic. Thunder can be referred to as Yahweh's *rēaʿ* (Job 36:33, context obscure; text?).

2. *War Cry.* A war cry is raised at the moment of attack or during battle, e.g., at the fall of Jericho (Josh. 6:5,10,16,20; vv. 5 and 20 state that the shout was accompanied by a trumpet blast), when the army goes out to attack the Philistines (1 S. 17:20, with *bammilḥāmâ;* cf. v. 52 during pursuit), or in Abijah's war against Jeroboam (2 Ch. 13:15; cf. v. 12, with *milḥāmâ*). Am. 2:2 associates the destruction of Moab with *tᵉrûʿâ* and the sound of the *šôp̱ār,* and, according to Zeph. 1:16, the day of Yahweh is "a day of the *šôp̱ār* and *tᵉrûʿâ*" (likewise Joel 2:1). Jer. 4:19 also associates *šôp̱ār* with "the alarm of war" (*tᵉrûʿaṯ milḥāmâ;* the same expression appears in 49:2): the enemy launches an attack (cf. the "standard" in 4:21). Hos. 5:8 associates both *šôp̱ār* and *ḥᵃṣōṣᵉrâ* with *rwʿ* hiphil.[4] According to Job 39:25, the warhorse smells the battle from afar and is aroused by the sound of the trumpet and the shouts of battle.

It is not always clear whether *rwʿ/tᵉrûʿâ* means simply the "noise of battle" in general or more specifically a call to arms accompanied by the sound of the horn and trumpet. In Ezk. 21:27(Eng. 22), at any rate, it is clear that the king of Babylon raises his voice *(qôl)* for the *tᵉrûʿâ* (the par. word is probably not *reṣaḥ* but an otherwise unattested word *ṣeraḥ,* "war cry").

Isa. 42:13 depicts Yahweh as a warrior, who raises a battle cry, shouts aloud (*ṣrḥ* hiphil), and challenges the enemy to battle (*gbr* hithpael[5]). In Ps. 108:10(9) Yahweh shouts a war cry *(rwʿ)* against the Philistines; since the context has to do with a show of power, a shout of triumph is also possible (the par. text in Ps. 60:10[8] should be emended to follow Ps. 108). Jer. 50:15 also suggests a shout of triumph, for Babylon has already fallen. The shouts of the Philistines in Jgs. 15:14 should probably be understood as a signal to attack: they rush shouting at Samson.

The text dealing with the two silver trumpets in Nu. 10:1-10 (a late interpolation into P) describes their double use. On the one hand, blowing *(tāqaʿ)* the trumpets summons the congregation to assemble at the tent of meeting; on the other, it serves as an alarm (*hērîaʿ,* vv. 7,9; *tāqaʿ tᵉrûʿâ,* vv. 5,6), to signal for departure during the wilderness period (vv. 5,6) and later to summon the people for defense against attacking enemies (v. 9). That such trumpets were found in the postexilic temple is shown by their depiction on the Arch of Titus.[6] The alarm trumpets *(ḥᵃṣōṣᵉrôṯ tᵉrûʿâ)* are mentioned

---

3. See *BHS* and comms.
4. On the historical situation see J. Jeremias, *Hosea. ATD* XXIV/1 (1983), 80-81.
5. *GesB.*
6. M. Noth, *Numbers. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1980), 75.

again in Nu. 31:6, in the context of a battle with the Midianites, as well as in 2 Ch. 13:12, where the priests use the trumpets to summon *(hērîa' 'al)* the Israelites to battle. These therefore are used to sound a military signal in a cultic context.

But there is also a trumpet blast that is purely cultic. According to Lev. 25:9, the sabbatical year is to be proclaimed by sounding a loud trumpet *(šôp̄ar tᵉrû'â)* on the tenth day of the seventh month. Lev. 23:24 calls the first day of the seventh month a "sabbath observance, a commemoration with trumpet blasts" *(šabbāṯôn zik̲rôn tᵉrû'â)* and a "holy convocation" *(miqrā' qōḏeš;* cf. Nu. 29:1, *yôm tᵉrû'â).* This is the ancient New Year's Day: the new year is proclaimed by a trumpet blast. That the "commemoration" involves remembrance before Yahweh is suggested by Nu. 10:10.

3. *Shouts of Joy.* Shouting can also express joy or gladness. The setting of Isa. 16:10 is an oracle describing the destruction of Moab: there is no joy or gladness *(śimḥâ, gîl),* no shout of rejoicing (*rnn, rw'* polel) in the vineyards. The usual rejoicing over the harvest has failed to appear. Ps. 65:14(13) describes this rejoicing with the verbs *rw'* hithpael and *šîr,* "sing." On the other hand, the heavens, the depths, and the mountains are to sing and shout (*rnn, rw'* hiphil) when Yahweh acts to deliver his people (Isa. 44:23), and Zion-Jerusalem is to sing, shout, and rejoice *(rnn, rw'* hiphil, *śmḥ, 'lz)* when Yahweh takes away the judgment against her (Zeph. 3:14); we may note that v. 15 calls Yahweh the king of Israel, so that royal acclamation is probably implied (see below).

When the ark was rescued from the Philistines and brought back into the camp of the Israelites, they gave a mighty shout of joy *(hērîa' tᵉrû'â gᵉḏôlâ,* 1 S. 4:5; cf. v. 6). Later, when David brought the ark to Jerusalem, this was done *biṯrû'â ûḇᵉqôl šôp̄ār* (2 S. 6:15 = 1 Ch. 15:28). This expression clearly denotes a cultic shout of joy accompanied by the sound of the trumpet. After the return from Babylon, the rebuilding of the temple was begun similarly, with a great shout of joy (*hērî'û tᵉrû'â gᵉḏôlâ,* Ezr. 3:11,13), which v. 13 also describes as *tᵉrû'aṯ śimḥâ.* In Job 8:21 *śᵉḥôq,* "laughter," parallels *tᵉrû'â:* God will fill Job's mouth with laughter and his lips with shouts of joy. God was also hailed with shouts of joy (*rnn, rw'* hiphil) by the morning stars and the "sons of God" when the foundations of the world were laid (Job 38:7).

A king is greeted with a royal acclamation. When Saul was chosen king, the people acclaimed (*rw'* hiphil) him and shouted: "Long live the king!" (1 S. 10:24). Likewise the king of the age of salvation will be acclaimed with shouts of joy (*gîl, rw'* hiphil, Zec. 9:9). The second Balaam oracle describes Israel as shouting a royal acclamation (*tᵉrû'aṯ meleḵ,* Nu. 23:21); the context indicates that Yahweh is the king in question.

4. *Cultic Shouts.* The Psalms frequently call for cultic shouts of rejoicing, especially in contexts where Yahweh is acclaimed as king. The verb *rnn* appears either in parallel or in the immediate context (Ps. 47:2[1]; 81:2[1]; 95:1; 98:4; 100:1). In 47:2(1) the shout of joy *(bᵉqôl rinnâ)* is accompanied by clapping of hands *(tq' kap̱);* the psalm declares that God has "gone up" *('ālâ)* with *tᵉrû'â* and the sound of a trumpet (v. 6[5]) and has been enthroned (v. 9[8]). In 95:1 *rnn* stands in parallel; in v. 2 *rw'* hiphil is qualified by *zᵉmîrôṯ;* Yahweh's kingship is expressed in v. 3. In 98:4 the two verbs *psḥ* and *zmr*

stand alongside *rnn* in the second hemistich; v. 6 speaks of *hᵃṣôṣᵉrôṯ* and *šôp̱ār,* and *hārîʻû* is qualified by "before King Yahweh." In 33:3 the call to sing a new song (an expression typical of the psalms celebrating Yahweh's kingship) is expanded by "play with *tᵉrûʻâ*"; creation is among the topics in the rest of the psalm. In 89:16(15), too, the Creator — who of course is also king of the universe — is acclaimed with a shout. There is no reference to Yahweh as king in 100:1, but *bᵉśimḥâ* and *birnānâ* confirm the joyous nature of the shouts during the entrance procession before the gates of the sanctuary. Ps. 66 is a thanksgiving psalm; v. 1 calls on the earth to make a joyful noise, qualified in v. 2 as *zmr* piel, and to "give glory and *tᵉhillâ*." Vv. 5-6 and 11-12 refer to the exodus miracle. In 81:2(1) *rnn* appears again in parallel; the following verses mention various musical instruments, including the *šôp̱ār.* That a cultic celebration is involved is clear from the context. It is noteworthy that the words of Yahweh in vv. 9ff.(8ff.) allude to the Decalogue, possibly suggesting a covenant festival.

Ps. 27:6 speaks of *ziḇḥê ṯᵉrûʻâ,* probably referring to sacrifices accompanied by shouts of joy, especially since the context uses both *zmr* and *šîr.* Ps. 150:5 mentions *ṣilṣᵉlê ṯᵉrûʻâ,* which the NRSV renders as "loud clashing cymbals." The expression "see God's face with *tᵉrûʻâ*" (NRSV "come into God's presence with joy") appears to refer to a thanksgiving liturgy. In 2 Ch. 15:14 we are dealing with a solemn oath in the setting of a festal liturgy.

III. LXX. The LXX translation of the verb *rw'* varies to suit the context; most frequently we find *alalázein, sēmaínein, boán,* or *salpízein.* The commonest translations of *tᵉrûʻâ* are *alalagmós, kraugḗ,* and *sēmasía.*

IV. Dead Sea Scrolls. In the Dead Sea Scrolls the verb *rw'* and the noun *tᵉrûʻâ* appear almost exclusively in the War Scroll. In the context of battle, the scroll refers in general terms to the shouts of gods and humans (1QM 1:11) and of the holy ones as they pursue Assyria (18:2). The priests sound the war alarm on trumpets (*ḥᵃṣôṣᵉrôṯ,* 8:8; 9:1; 16:9; 17:12,15) and the Levites on horns (*šôp̱ār,* 8:9; 16:8; 17:13; cf. 8:15). A signal for the duration *(nṣḥ)* of the battle is mentioned twice (8:12; 9:2). The sounding of *ḥᵃṣôṣᵉrôṯ hazzikkārôn* (18:3) is explained by 10:7: "You shall blow the trumpets and you shall be remembered (*zkr* hiphil) before your God" (cf. Nu. 10:10). The expression *tāqaʻ tᵉrûʻâ* appears in 8:7; 16:4-6; 17:11. The end of the battle is signaled when the war alarm dies away; then the priests sound the "trumpets of the slain" (16:9).

CD 11:22 speaks of summoning the assembly with *ḥᵃṣôṣᵉrôṯ haqqāhāl.* The fragmentary text 11QT 25:3 alludes to celebration of the New Year's Festival according to Lev. 23:25. In the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice (4Q402 fr. 8, 2) *tᵉrûʻâ* appears in the context of a heavenly liturgy that has incorporated elements of the eschatological war.

Ringgren

רוץ *rûṣ*; מֵרוֹץ *mērôṣ*; מְרוּצָה *m^erûṣâ*

I. Distribution. II. Other Semitic Languages. III. Lexical Field. IV. Usage: 1. Qal; 2. Pilel; 3. Hiphil; 4. Derivatives. V. LXX and Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Distribution. The verb occurs 103 times: 96 times in the qal (93 times omitting conjectural readings in Isa. 42:4; Eccl. 12:6; 2 Ch. 23:12) plus a single occurrence in Sir. 11:11), 6 times in the hiphil (5 omitting a conjectural reading in Ps. 68:32[Eng. 31]), and once in the pilpel. It has two nominal derivatives with a preformative syllable: *mērôṣ* (once) and *m^erûṣâ* (3 times).

II. Other Semitic Languages. The only other language in which the root occurs frequently is Ethiopic: *rōṣa,* "run (to, into, by, apart), rush, attack."[1] The causative *(arōṣa)* and intransitive-reflexive *(tarāwaṣa)* stems are also found. Derivatives include *rĕwūṣ,* "running; quick, speedy"; *rūṣat,* "swift movement, running"; *rawāṣī,* "runner; quick, speedy, nimble"; *mrwāṣ,* "race, track." In Akkadian, *râṣu(m)* means "run" (Old Bab. *râṣu qablum,* "charge into battle") and "come to someone's aid" (Middle Bab.: kings, etc.);[2] the latter meaning is not found in the OT. The qal of *rwṣ* occurs just once in Old Aramaic, with a horseman as subject.[3] In Middle Hebrew, *rûṣ* means "run," lit. "press," and "be pressed."[4] The hiphil *hērîṣ* (a synonym of *rāṣaṣ*) means "push, crush." Aram. *r^ehaṭ* and Syr. *r^ehēṭ* are etymologically related.

III. Lexical Field. In Hebrew, *rûṣ* denotes rapid, purposeful running with an urgent motivation ("run, hasten, charge"). The speed of the movement is underlined by the use of a verbal form of *mihar,* "hasten," in parallel or in hendiadys: Jgs. 13:10; 1 S. 17:48; Isa. 59:7 = Prov. 1:16; cf. Prov. 6:18 (cf. also Nu. 17:12[Eng. 16:47] with 17:11[16:46] and Gen. 24:20). Speed can also be emphasized by the adv. *m^ehērâ,* "swiftly" (Ps. 147:15; cf. Josh. 8:19). The verb can also stand in parallel with *hālak,* "go, walk"; but the context shows that the action is rapid (cf. 1 S. 3:5 with 3:6,8 and 2 S. 18:24 with 18:25) or vigorous (Isa. 40:31; Prov. 4:12).

The running may be welcoming or hostile: hastening to meet a guest with courtesy and respect, or charging the foe (a city wall) ready for battle. Often, too, the verb is used when an important message must be delivered without delay.

The subject is almost always a person or the person's feet (Isa. 59:7 = Prov. 1:16; 6:18) or eyes (Hab. 2:2, indirectly). Five texts speak of running animals: Am. 6:12 (horses); Dnl. 8:6 (a goat); Joel 2:4,7,9 (locusts, indirectly). Once the runner is an angel (Zec. 2:8[4]), God (Job 16:14), or God's word (Ps. 147:15). Once God makes peo-

1. *LexLingAeth,* 308-9.
2. *AHw,* II, 960.
3. *DISO,* 276.
4. *WTM,* IV, 435-36.

ple run (Jer. 50:44 = 49:19) and once the wicked are described as running against God (Job 15:26). The verb appears twice with an inanimate but mobile subject: chariots in Nah. 2:5(4), the sun in Ps. 19:6(5).

As its meaning would suggest, the verb appears primarily (64 times) in narrative sections of the historical books, primarily (43 times) the Dtr History (esp. Samuel and Kings; 12 times in the Pentateuch). It appears 20 times in the prophetic books and 19 times in the wisdom books.

IV. Usage.

1. *Qal.* Although *rûṣ* always refers to rapid running, the running can have various motivations.

a. *Urgency.* Usually it is an urgent and important matter that lends speed to the runner's feet. Abraham's servant, eager for a sign from God, runs to meet Rebekah, in order to determine whether she is meant by God to be Isaac's wife (Gen. 24:17). Since Yahweh has threatened to destroy the Israelites on account of the murmuring, Aaron runs into the middle of the assembly with his censer to make atonement for the people and avert the disaster (Nu. 17:12[16:47]). In order to appease Yahweh's wrath, the messengers sent by Joshua run instantly into Achan's tent to secure the booty that should have been put to the ban (Josh. 7:22). An urgent matter also motivates the running in 1 S. 3:5; 10:23; 17:22; 20:6,36; 1 K. 19:20; 2 K. 5:20-21.

When Joash was anointed king, the people ran to him *(hā'ām hārāṣîm)* to do him homage (2 Ch. 23:12; in the par. text 2 K. 11:13, where the words are reversed, either *hā'ām* or better *hārāṣîm*[5] should be deleted).

The bride, impatient with desire, hastens (cohortative: *nārûṣâ,* "let us run"!) to the royal bridegroom because she longs to enjoy his love in his chambers (Cant. 1:4).

Because the inhabitants of Jerusalem hurry off to their own houses (i.e., labor industriously for their own private well-being) while the house of Yahweh lies in ruins, they are threatened with a failed harvest as punishment for their impious selfishness (Hag. 1:9; cf. Sir. 11:11: "There are those who work and struggle and hurry" — *speúdōn* = *wrṣ* [act. ptcp.]).

Since *rûṣ* conveys the notion of rapid movement, it can be used figuratively for riding on a donkey (2 K. 4:22) or horse (Joel 2:4); in Aramaic the first inscription of King Barrakib of Sam'al uses the verb for a horseman who rides alongside the chariot of his lord.[6] The eyes as well as the feet can move quickly. Thus Habakkuk is to write his vision plainly on tablets so that "the reader runs over it [the vision]" (Hab. 2:2: *yārûṣ [Q: haq-]qôrê' bô*). This means that the reader's eyes can run along the lines, i.e., the text can be read quickly and effortlessly because the script is clear.

In Ps. 19:5b-7(4b-6), a hymn in praise of the sun based on ancient Near Eastern models, the sun runs its course with joy like a strong man (v. 6[5]) from one end of the

5. E. Würthwein, *Die Bücher des Könige II. ATD* XI/2 ([6]1984), 344.

6. *KAI,* 216.8; *DISO,* 276.

heavens to the other. Here the sun appears as living power, recalling the Babylonian sun god Shamash, who "hastens through unknown, distant regions."[7]

b. *Racing.* A human being cannot match the swiftness of a horse. When the prosperity of the wicked makes Jeremiah question the justice of God, God uses a proverbial image to confront him with even greater difficulties: "If you have raced with foot-runners and they have wearied you, how will you compete with horses?" (Jer. 12:5). Amos uses the observation that horses do not run on rocks in an attempt to convict his listeners of the perversity and foolishness of their sinful ways (Am. 6:12).

c. *News.* A person may run to report an interesting incident or convey important news (Gen. 24:28; 29:12; Nu. 11:27; Jgs. 13:10). The outcome of a battle is reported as quickly as possible (1 S. 4:12; 2 S. 18:19-26 [10 occurrences of *rûṣ*]).

In the third of Zechariah's visions, an angel commands the messenger angel to run to the prophet and tell him that Jerusalem is under the special protection of God (Zec. 2:8[4]). God's creative word is also sent to earth like a messenger (cf. Ps. 107:20), where God's command runs swiftly *(mᵉhērâ)* to be realized in natural events (Ps. 147:15). Although they have not been sent by God, the false prophets run fanatically to proclaim their own words (Jer. 23:21).

The active participle, one use of which is to describe a continuous activity, is used for the office of "courier" (*rāṣ,* "runner"). During the conquest of Babylon, presented as the judgment of God, the prophet describes dramatically how "one runner runs to meet another" (paronomasia: *rāṣ liqraʾṯ-rāṣ yārûṣ;* in parallel with *rāṣ* we find *maggîḏ,* "messenger") in order to report the destruction of the city to the king (Jer. 51:31). For the observance to the Passover festival, King Hezekiah sends couriers throughout the land (2 Ch. 30:6,10). Job feels that his days are fleeing away more swiftly than a runner or courier (Job 9:25).

The original meaning "runner" has almost vanished when the book of Esther speaks of mounted couriers. The enormous Persian Empire had a well-organized and functional postal system, by means of which important royal decrees could be disseminated to all the provinces in a short space of time (cf. Est. 3:13,15).[8] The letters were sent "by mounted couriers riding on fast steeds bred from the royal herd" (NRSV; or "by official mounted couriers belonging to various stations";[9] the LXX translates *hārāṣîm* in 3:13 and 8:10 with *bibliaphóroi;* generally the Greeks used the Persian loanword *ángaroi* for these couriers).

d. *Hospitality.* In the important domain of hospitality, etiquette requires the host to run to meet the visitor with deference and attentiveness — like Abraham, who jumps up from his siesta and runs to meet the three visitors to invite them into his tent (Gen. 18:2; cf. 24:29; 29:13; 33:4; 2 K. 4:26). That they may enjoy proper hospitality, he hastens (*wayᵉmahēr,* v. 6) to Sarah and runs (*rāṣ,* v. 7) to the herd to get a calf to prepare for them. Rebekah, too, quickly *(wattᵉmahēr)* empties her jar into the trough and runs

7. *SAHG,* 240ff.

8. On the Persian postal system see also Herodotus 8.98 and Xenophon *Cyrop.* 8.6.17.

9. G. Gerleman, *Esther. BK* XXI (^{2}1982), 125, 128-29.

(wattārōṣ) to the well to draw water for the camels of Abraham's servant, as hospitality toward a stranger requires (Gen. 24:20).

e. *Battle.* One may run toward others with hostile as well as friendly intent (cf. Old Bab. *râṣu qablum,* "charge into battle"). David runs toward Goliath to engage him in single combat and then leaps to cut off his head (1 S. 17:48,51). The Israelites rush against Ai to destroy the town (Josh. 8:19). Dnl. 8:6 uses the image of a goat charging a ram to represent the campaign of the Greek army under Alexander the Great against the empire of the Medes and Persians. Joel compares the devastating plague of locusts, which symbolizes the imminent day of Yahweh, to an enemy storming a fortress. Like horsemen (2:4) or foot soldiers (2:7), these devouring insects advance, leaping like warriors upon a city and storming its walls (2:9).

In Ps. 59:5(4) the accused and persecuted psalmist likens the bloodthirsty adversaries to soldiers charging into battle. In Ps. 62, a prayer of the same genre, v. 4(3) also uses the image of a hostile charge (against a city wall); here *t^erāṣṣ^ehû* is commonly emended to the more appropriate *tārûṣû* or *t^erûṣûhû.*[10] Aided by Yahweh, the royal speaker in Ps. 18:30(29) = 2 S. 22:30 feels so strong and daring that he can overcome all obstacles, charging and leaping over walls (emending *'āruṣ g^edûḏ,* "go on a raid,"[11] to *'āruṣ gāḏēr;* cf. LXX^L in 2 S. 22:30: *pephragménos = gāḏûr).*

The wicked, who arrogantly challenge the Almighty, like soldiers protected by their shields run stubbornly against God, declares Eliphaz in his second discourse (Job 15:26). But Job responds (16:14) that it is God who rushes at him like a warrior, his strokes making breach upon breach in the fortress of his person until it finally falls. (The LXX, with its *édramon prós me dynámenoi* [as already in v. 13], seeks to avoid the negative image of God as a warrior.)

Gideon's surprise attack on the Midianite army in the middle of the night causes such panic that the whole camp runs around (in confusion) and takes to its heels (Jgs. 7:21).

f. *The Way of God.* Wisdom texts describe the just as running God's ways. In Ps. 119, the embodiment of postexilic devotion to the *tôrâ,* the psalmist avows (v. 32) that he runs the ways of Yahweh's commandments. The point is presumably to emphasize the enthusiastic engagement of the devout psalmist as well as the usefulness and trustworthiness of the *tôrâ* as the way that leads with certainty to the goal. The way of wisdom, as the disciples learn from their master, is a clear and level path on which one can walk unhampered and run without stumbling (Prov. 4:12). Deutero-Isaiah cheers the weary and discouraged exiles with the message that God will renew the strength of the faithful so that they will run and not be weary (Isa. 40:31: *yārûṣû* par. *yēl^eḵû).* Prov. 18:10 uses a different image to express the security that Yahweh bestows on the faithful: Yahweh's name (standing here for "person") is a strong tower to which the righteous run for safety.

In Prov. 29:6 the emendation of *yārûn* to *yārûṣ* is dubious.[12]

---

10. *BHS;* H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1989), 12.

11. *HAL,* III, 1208; A. Weiser, *Psalms. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1991): "With you I overrun the troop" (cf. NRSV).

12. *GK,* §67q; cf. *BHS;* H. Ringgren, *Sprüche. ATD* XVI/1 (³1981), 110: "The righteous 'runs.'"

g. *The Way of the Wicked.* Prov. 1:16 = Isa. 59:7 says of the wicked that their feet run *(yārûṣû)* to evil and hurry *(wîmahᵃrû)* to shed innocent blood. The same idiom, "feet that hasten to run *(mᵉmahᵃrôṯ lārûṣ)* to evil," appears also in Prov. 6:18.

h. *Before a Dignitary.* According to 1 K. 18:46,[13] when the hand of the Lord came upon Elijah, he was vouchsafed superhuman strength, so that he was able to run some 15 miles before Ahab's chariot.

The same prepositional idiom (*rûṣ lip̱nê* + "chariot") appears also in 1 S. 8:11, but with a totally different meaning. In this text, which is hostile to the monarchy, Samuel warns the people of the claims to absolute power that will be made by the king they are requesting — he will, e.g., make their sons run before his chariot as a mark of rank and respect. The institution of a chariot and horses, borrowed from the gentile world, and the maintenance of a personal bodyguard were viewed as a negative development by the Deuteronomist. The Deuteronomist also considers it presumptuous that David's sons Absalom and Adonijah, lusting for power, should each acquire a chariot and horses, with fifty men to run ahead of him, as a token of his claim to the kingship (2 S. 15:1; 1 K. 1:5).

i. *Royal Officers.* Early on in the monarchy, there evolved from this bodyguard the institution of the "runners" (*hārāṣîm;* always pl. and always with the article), a corps of professional soldiers who guarded the life and the palace of the ruler. Even Saul is reported to have had such "runners" — at first probably armed men who accompanied him during his military exploits and to whom he could give orders, e.g., to kill the priests of Nob (1 S. 22:17). Such runners are mentioned in conjunction with just three later kings. In 1 K. 14:27-28 = 2 Ch. 12:10-11 we read that the runners (NRSV "officers") guarding the palace always accompanied King Rehoboam when he went to the temple; they were equipped with bronze shields, which they then brought back to the guardroom. Jehu commanded the runners to slay the worshipers of Baal (2 K. 10:25).

Runners appear once again in the account of the enthronement of Joash (2 K. 11:4-20), a late addition, heavily edited, to the Dtr History. Originally, according to Würthwein,[14] the priest Jehoiada summoned only the captains of hundreds to protect and enthrone the king; nowhere are these captains represented as a bodyguard, although they may probably be identified with the leaders of the militia, specified in vv. 14, 19, 20 by the technical term "the people of the land." Later, when this political function had been forgotten and the enthronement of the king came to be understood as a putsch carried out by the bodyguard, the "Carites and runners" were interpolated into vv. 4 and 19 and the "runners" into vv. 6 (the entire verse being an explanatory gloss) and 11.

This theory finds support in the interpretation of the LXX and the parallel account in 2 Ch. 23. The LXX, which normally uses *hoi paratréchontes* to translate *hārāṣîm,* did not translate "Carites and runners" in 2 K. 11:4,19, but treated the two words as proper names: *Chorri* and *Rasim.* In 2 Ch. 23:1 they are omitted entirely, and in v. 20

---

13. On the Dtr redaction of this verse see Würthwein, *ATD* XI/2, 214.
14. *Ibid.,* 344-51.

they are replaced with "those noble and eminent among the people." Furthermore, the "runners" of 2 K. 11:6 do not appear in 2 Ch. 23:5, and in 2 Ch. 23:10 (= 2 K. 11:11) they are replaced with "all the people." The original text spoke only of "the gate of the runners" (2 K. 11:19), through which Joash is escorted into the palace; it also recalls the function of the runners as palace guards. Here too, however, 2 Ch. 23:20 has deleted "runners" and inserted "upper gate" *(šaʿar hāʿelyôn;* LXX *pýlēs esōtéras).*

j. *Emendations.* In Isa. 42:4 *yārûṣ* should be vocalized as *yērôṣ,* the niphal of *rāṣaṣ,* "be crushed" (cf. *rāṣûṣ* in v. 3); this reading is also supported by the LXX (*thraúein,* "shatter").[15] In Eccl. 12:6, similarly, *wᵉṯāruṣ* should be vocalized as *wᵉṯērōṣ,* likewise the niphal of *rāṣaṣ.*

2. *Pilel.* The pilel appears only once, in Nah. 2:5(4), which describes chariots as darting about *(yᵉrôṣēṣû)* like lightning. In Ezk. 1:14 the living creatures also dart about (*rāṣô',* perhaps a by-form of *rûṣ;* or to be read as *yāṣᵉʾû yāṣô'*[16]).

3. *Hiphil.* The hiphil has the causative meaning "make . . . run" to get or bring something quickly. At Pharaoh's command, e.g., Joseph is brought quickly out of the dungeon (Gen. 41:14). During the Philistine war, David is to carry food quickly to the camp of his brothers (1 S. 17:17). When the Passover was celebrated under Josiah, the Levites quickly carried the cooked offerings to the people (2 Ch. 35:13). Here too, urgent matters are involved.[17]

In one instance it is God who causes the running. Like a lion coming up from the thickets of the Jordan and instantly putting to flight (*hirgîaʿ hērîṣ*[18]) the animals grazing in the meadows, so in an oracle against Babylon will Yahweh use a nation advancing from the north to chase away the inhabitants of Chaldea (Jer. 50:44; later this image was incorporated into an oracle against Edom: Jer. 49:19[19]).

In Ps. 68:32(31) *tārîṣ* should be read either as *tārîm* (Cush lifts its hands to God) or as *tāraṣ yāḏêhû,* corresponding to Akk. *tiriṣ qāti,* "stretch forth one's hand," used in Middle and Late Babylonian as a gesture of prayer (on the part of a king).[20]

4. *Derivatives.* a. *mērôṣ.* Only in Eccl. 9:11 do we find the noun *mērôṣ,* derived from *rûṣ* with a *mem* preformative. Since by God's incomprehensible decree mortals are governed by "time and chance," even the most proficient can fail. Thus it may happen that the swift do not always prove victorious in a race.[21]

b. *mᵉrûṣâ.* The derivative *mᵉrûṣâ* describes a manner or style of running, so that one can see even from afar who it is (2 S. 18:27, twice). Figuratively it denotes a way of

---

15. *BHS;* see *GK,* §67q.
16. *GK,* 343 n. 2.
17. As in IV.1.a above.
18. *HAL,* III, 1208: "chase away quickly."
19. A. Weiser, *Jeremia. ATD* XX/XXI (^{6}1981-82), 409.
20. *AHw,* III, 1349; cf. A. Weiser, *Psalms. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1991): "hasten."
21. W. Zimmerli, *Prediger. ATD* XVI (^{3}1980), 228: "make the race"; cf. also Am. 2:15.

life, the manner in which a person lives from a moral perspective. The general decline of morality, which involves even priests and prophets, makes Jeremiah assert that their "course" — i.e., the conduct of their lives — is evil (Jer. 23:10).[22] Jer. 8:6 emphasizes more the speed with which Israel turns away from Yahweh, as the appended simile shows: "Quick as a horse plunging into battle."

V. LXX and Dead Sea Scrolls. In the vast majority of instances (73 out of 86), the LXX translates the qal of *rûṣ* with a form of *tréchein;* the narrative aorist *(édramon),* with 31 occurrences, is most common. The verb is also used 11 times with the prefix *ek-, epi-, kata-, para-,* or *pros-.* Seven times we find a form of *diṓkein,* three times *exérchesthai,* and once *katapheúgein.*

The pilel is represented by *diatréchein,* the hiphil once by *tréchein,* once by *diatréchein,* twice by *ekdiṓkein,* and once by *exágein.* The derivatives *mērôṣ* and *m^erûṣâ* are both represented by *drómos.*

The verb occurs only three times in the Dead Sea Scrolls, in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice. The subject in each case is *'lwhym* or *'ly d't* (4Q402 fr. 4, 9 [military context]; 403 fr. 1, 2:6 [alluding to Ezk. 1:13-14; 10]; 405 fr. 23, 1:11).

Maiberger

---

22. Weiser, *ATD* 20/21[6], 200: "They run after evil"; EÜ: "Evil is their goal."

רוש *rwš;* רָשׁ/רָאשׁ *rāš/rā'š;* רִישׁ/רֵישׁ/רֵאשׁ *rîš/rêš/rē'š*

I. Etymology. II. 1. Forms and Occurrences; 2. Parallel Words. III. General Usage: 1. Finite Verb; 2. Participle; 3. Noun. IV. Theological Significance. V. Dead Sea Scrolls and LXX.

---

rwš. J. Barth, *NSS,* esp. 79; M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography IX," *Bibl* 52 (1971) 337-56, esp. 351ff.; T. Donald, "The Semantic Field of Rich and Poor in the Wisdom Literature of Hebrew and Accadian," *OrAnt* 3 (1964) 27-41; J. W. Gaspar, "Social Ideas in the Wisdom Literature of the OT" (diss., Washington, 1947); R. Gordis, "The Social Background of Wisdom Literature," *HUCA* 18 (1944) 77-118; A. Guillaume, "Hebrew and Arabic Lexicography, a Comparative Study II," *AbrNahrain* 2 (1960/61) 5-35, esp. 30; Y. I. Kim, "The Vocabulary of Oppression in the OT" (diss., Drew, 1981); A. Kuschke, "Arm und reich im AT," *ZAW* 57 (1939) 31-57; S. van Leeuwen, *Le développement du sens social en Israël avant l'ère chrétienne. SSN* 1 (1955); N. Lohfink, "Die Bedeutungen von hebr. *jrš qal* und *hif,*" *BZ* 27 (1983) 14-33; idem, "Textkritisches zu *jrš* im AT," *Mélanges D. Barthélemy. OBO* 38 (1981), 273-88; M. Lurje, *Studien zur Geschichte der wirtschaftlichen und sozialen Verhältnisse im israelitisch-jüdischen Reiche. BZAW* 45 (1927); D. Michel, "Armut. II. AT," *TRE,* IV, 72-76; G. S. Ogden, "Historical

I. Etymology. The root commonly represented as *rwš* appears only in Hebrew. Its relationship to other verbs, esp. *yāraš* (see below) and *ršš*,[1] and its unstable orthography make its etymology appear uncertain. Both Zorell and Even-Shoshan posit a root *rîš*,[2] which might be supported by the noun *rîš/rêš*,[3] whereas the root is commonly identified as *rwš*, primarily on the basis of the finite verb forms; one lexicon leaves the choice open.[4] In addition, an *aleph* sometimes appears as a vowel letter in both the participle (3 occurrences of *rā'š* alongside *rāš*) and the noun (2 occurrences of *rē'š* alongside *rêš*).[5] These etymologies assume a triliteral root, but this assumption may be dubious;[6] also possible is "a semantic confusion with other roots deriving from the biliteral **rt*," esp. the root → ירש *yāraš*.[7]

II. 1. *Forms and Occurrences.* Because of the etymological questions just described, before examining the forms and occurrences of this root we must first clarify its relationship to the verb *yāraš*. It comes closest to the niphal of *yāraš* (Gen. 45:11 [where *BHK/BHS* read *tûraš*, the hophal of *rûš*]; Prov. 20:13; 23:21; 30:9 [where the hophal *'ûraš* has been proposed]).[8] Among the occurrences of the hiphil, 1 S. 2:7 stands out (where some read *mērîš*, the hiphil of *rûš*).[9] Except for these proposed readings, no hiphil or hophal of *rûš* is attested. Finally the form *hlyršnw* in Jgs. 14:15 (cf. Dt. 28:42) is uncertain: it might be read either as a piel infinitive (with *metheg*) or as a qal of *yāraš*.[10] Here too a hiphil of *rûš (halhārîšēnî)* has been proposed;[11] but Lohfink has cited linguistic arguments, both historical and semantic, that make a strong case for interpreting these words as forms of the verb *yāraš* (see above). Therefore we may ignore here all proposed emendations of *yāraš* to some form of *rûš*.

Of the 31 occurrences of words derived from *rwš*, most (24) are instances of the verb; but there are only 2 occurrences of a finite form, a qal in Ps. 34:11(Eng. 10) and a hithpolel in Prov. 13:7, whereas the participle accounts for the remainder (20 times sg.,

---

Allusions in Qohelet IV 13-16?" *VT* 30 (1980) 309-15; M. Schwantes, *Das Recht der Armen. BBET* 4 (1977), esp. 16-20, 109-275; U. Skladny, *Die ältesten Spruchsammlungen in Israel* (Göttingen, 1962); W. Thiel, *Die soziale Entwicklung Israels in vorstaatlicher Zeit* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, ²1985); H. E. von Waldow, "Social Responsibility and Social Structure in Early Israel," *CBQ* 32 (1970) 182-204.

→ אביון *'ebyôn;* → דל *dal;* → חצר *ḥāṣēr;* → ירש *yāraš;* → ענה *'ānâ* II; → עשר *'āšar.*

1. *BDB,* 930; *LexHebAram,* 771; Mandelkern, 1085; see also *GK,* §72dd.
2. *LexHebAram,* 764, 771; Even-Shoshan, 2001.
3. But see Meyer, §80.1c.
4. *BDB,* 930.
5. *GK,* §23g; also *BLe,* §56u″.
6. Meyer, §80.1b,c.
7. N. Lohfink, → VI, 378. Further, → VI, 368-96, esp. 369ff.; see also Lohfink, "Textkritisches," 279-80, 287; *idem,* "Bedeutungen," 14, 25-26, 33; cf. Schwantes, 17-18.
8. The last proposal by *HAL,* II, 441. See *GesB,* 321; *LexHebAram,* 333; F. Delitzsch, *Die Lese- und Schreibfehler im AT* (Berlin, 1920), 65-66.
9. *BHK; HAL,* II, 441; cf. *GesB,* 321.
10. Lohfink, → VI, 372; see *BHK/BHS;* also *HP,* 211.
11. *HAL,* II, 441.

twice pl.), so that substantival usage nevertheless predominates.[12] There are also 7 occurrences of the subst. *rîš/rêš/rēʾš,* all in Proverbs. Most of the occurrences of the verb (16) are also in Proverbs, which has a total of 23 out of 31 occurrences of the root.

2. *Parallel Words.* When we examine the words used in parallel with the *rwš* group, we note at once that they are much oftener antonyms than synonyms. In addition, synonyms appear more frequently with the substantive than with the verb, e.g., *maḥsōr,* "want" (Prov. 6:11 = 24:34; cf. 28:27 and → חסר *ḥāsēr,* "lack," Ps. 34:11b[10b]); → עמל *ʿāmāl,* "misery" (Prov. 31:7); *qālôn,* "disgrace" (Prov. 13:18) and the attributive niphal ptcp. *(ʾîš) niqleh,* "(a man) of no repute" (1 S. 18:23; → קלה *qālâ*); used as nouns we find → דל *dal,* "poor" (Prov. 28:3; Ps. 82:3a [there also → יתום *yāṯôm,* "orphan"]) and *ʿānî,* "destitute" (Ps. 82:3b; → ענה *ʿānâ* II); finally, Ps. 34:11a(10a) uses a finite form of → רעה *rāʿâ,* "hunger."

But the word group that provides the most antonyms of *rwš* is → עשר *ʿāšar,* "be(come) rich," esp. the nominal formative *ʿāšîr,* "rich" (2 S. 12:1,4; Prov. 14:20; 18:23; 22:2 [cf. 29:13]; 22:7; 28:6 [cf. 19:1 in par. with *kᵉsîl,* "fool"]).[13] There are also two occurrences of the verb (hiphil, Prov. 10:4; hithpael, 13:7) and one of the subst. *ʿōšer,* "riches" (30:8; cf. also 13:8). Other antonyms of the noun include *ʾîš kāzāḇ,* "man of falsehood" (19:22),[14] *ʾîš tᵉḵāḵîm,* "oppressor" (29:13),[15] and (metaphorically) *kᵉpîrîm,* "young lions" (Ps. 34:11[10]; LXX *ploúsioi*).[16] In addition to *ʿōšer,* → הון *hôn,* "wealth," also appears as an antonym (Prov. 10:15).

III. General Usage. Our survey of the distribution of the root's occurrences and of related words has already displayed something of the peculiar usage profile of *rwš:* it is indigenous primarily to wisdom literature, and it serves to establish a sharp contrast between the "poor" and the "rich" (sg. or pl.).[17]

1. *Finite Verb.* This contrast comes to light, first of all, in the rare use of the verb. Prov. 13:7 deals with two different modes of conduct, both of which involve "great wealth" or lack of the same; here, however, rich and poor exchange their expected "roles." The verse may be meant ironically,[18] but more probably it expresses the relative value of wealth and poverty. In v. 11(10) of Ps. 34 (a wisdom psalm), the same "revaluation" of poverty/hunger and their opposite (*kol-ṭôḇ,* "all good things") is given a religious setting and justification (cf. also vv. 3,7,10,13[2,6,9,12]).[19] Behind the use of the verb, however, stands the socially determined polarity of "poor" and "rich."

---

12. See III.2 below.
13. M. Sæbø, *THAT,* I, 836ff.
14. See *BHS.*
15. O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos. BK* XVII (1984), 340-41.
16. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1988), 382.
17. On occurrences see II.1 above; on related words, II.2.
18. Plöger, *BK* XVII, 159.
19. Kraus, 387-88; Schwantes, 18.

2. *Participle.* The social background is more apparent in the use of the ptcp. *rāš/rā'š* (and the corresponding pls.).[20] This is true, for instance, in narrative contexts that contrast someone "poor" or "insignificant" with a king: when David, who is still poor, is identified as Saul's future son-in-law (1 S. 18:20ff.), as well as in the parable of the prophet Nathan, which depicts David as a rich man who is exploiting a poor man (2 S. 12:1ff.). In both cases the poor man is at the mercy of the powerful king; but a king's position of power can also be insecure (Eccl. 4:14).[21] In Ps. 82:3 God calls on the gods to perform their judicial roles properly in terms that recall "basic ordinances of OT justice";[22] the defenseless, who need special legal protection, include the "poor," for whom the text provides several synonyms (cf. also Eccl. 5:7[8]).

In the other occurrences of the participle in Proverbs, usage is more varied. In the first place, in a neutral, empirically grounded explanation of poverty, Prov. 10:4 states that "a slack hand causes poverty" ("but the hand of the diligent makes rich").[23] In other words, a poor person can be responsible for his or her own poverty. It is true, though, that this explanation is probably not entirely neutral; at least indirectly it can strike a negative note.

A negative view of poverty is apparent when the text states that the poor are disliked even by their neighbors and are shunned on account of their poverty (14:20; 19:7), or that a poor person is in the power of a rich creditor, becoming the latter's slave (22:7).[24] These negative consequences also exemplify the bitterly low social status of the poor. A particularly negative result is that one poor person may oppress another (28:3).

Finally, however, we also find positive statements about the poor. It may be considered a valorization of the poor when the text expresses their equality with the rich on the grounds that all have been created by God (22:2; 29:13) or states that "a mocking superiority toward the poor" is "an insult to Yahweh" (17:5;[25] cf. also 14:31) or that "generosity to the poor does not cause the giver to be in want" (28:27;[26] cf. 14:21). In addition, a positive moral assessment can be expressed by the common wisdom idiom "better . . . than . . ." (19:1; 28:6; 19:22) as well as by a reference to the abundant yield of a poor person's new field (13:23).[27]

3. *Noun.* The usage of the noun *rîš/rêš/rē'š,* which is limited to Proverbs (7 times),is more disparate than that of the participle. Here too we find laziness cited as a cause of poverty (6:11; 24:34; cf. also 28:19); there is still a harsh contrast between poverty and wealth, but the contrast can also be mitigated (30:8). Special concern for the poor finds

---

20. B. Gemser, *Sprüche Salomos. HAT* XVI ([3]1963), 61; Schwantes, 209ff.
21. Kuschke, 43; Skladny, 13-17, 25-29, 54-55, 57-58.
22. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1989), 156.
23. Following Plöger, *BK* XVII, 120.
24. H. Ringgren, *ATD* 16/1[3], 85.
25. Following Plöger, *BK* XVII, 201.
26. *Ibid.,* 339.
27. Following H. Ringgren, *Sprüche. ATD* XVI/1 ([3]1980), 57-58; for a different interpretation see Plöger, *BK* XVII, 156-57, 163-64.

expression in 31:7: they should be given drink to help them forget their condition. All the same, "poverty" and "disgrace" (in contrast to "honor") can be treated as synonymous (13:18).

IV. Theological Significance. The polarity of "poverty" and "wealth"[28] is of primary theological significance, along with the strong emphasis on the social situation. It would not be true to say, however, that the word group denotes "poverty in an exclusively socioeconomic sense."[29] Our survey of the root's usage has revealed not only the low social status and misery of the poor and the negative effects of poverty but also the religiously grounded humanity of the poor, as well as pointing positively to certain moral aspects of poverty. It must be added, however, that only in Ps. 82:3 does *rāš* ("poor person") parallel *'ānî* and other synonyms that often have religious overtones.[30]

God is not responsible for the emergence of poverty; but God has a special concern for those who have been impoverished, as we read elsewhere in the OT (e.g., Dt. 15:4ff.).

V. Dead Sea Scrolls and LXX. In the Dead Sea Scrolls the ptcp. *rāš*, "poor (person)," occurs rarely (1QH 2:34; 5:14,20), in the expression *nepeš 'ānî wārāš*, "the soul of the poor and needy,"[31] which shows that the word has more marked religious overtones.[32] The rarity of *rāš* in the scrolls is surprising in view of the frequent appearance of other terms in the lexical field of "poverty." But we may expect to find some 10 occurrences in the unpublished texts from 2Q through 10Q; there too the use of the word in parallel with other terms from the lexical field is peculiar.

The LXX uses a relatively restricted lexical field to translate the word group: *penía/pénēs* (8/6 times), *ptōchós* (9 times), *tapeinoún/tapeinós* (once each), and *daneistḗs* (once).[33]

Sæbø

28. → עשׁר *'āšar* IV.
29. Kuschke, 45; see also A. George, *DBS*, VII, 388.
30. → XI, 250. See II.2 above.
31. E. Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran* (Munich, ²1971), 119, 131.
32. S. Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot* (Aarhus, 1960), 290-91.
33. See F. Hauck, "πένης," *TDNT*, VI, 38-40; Hauck and S. Schulz, "πραΰς," *TDNT* VI, 647; and esp. E. Bammel, "πτωχός," *TDNT* VI, 888-94.

רָחַב rāḥaḇ; רַחַב raḥaḇ; רֹחַב rōḥaḇ; רָחָב rāḥāḇ רְחוֹב reḥôḇ; מֶרְחָב merḥāḇ

I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences; 3. Meaning; 4. Semantic Field. II. Usage: 1. Verb; 2. *rōḥaḇ/raḥaḇ;* 3. *reḥôḇ;* 4. *rāḥāḇ;* 5. *merḥāḇ.* III. 1. LXX; 2. Sirach; 3. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. 1. *Etymology.* The root *rḥb* is found in most Semitic languages with the basic meaning "be(come) broad, wide, expansive." Nominal derivatives can denote on the one hand the quality expressed in the stative verb, "wide, broad," as well as the abstract "width, expanse"; on the other hand they can denote concrete objects characterized by expansive breadth, such as "desert" or "open square" (in contrast to the generally narrow alleyways of Near Eastern towns). Outside the OT and Dead Sea Scrolls, the root occurs in Old Aramaic (*rḥb,* "be broad";[1] *rḥbh,* "desert"[2]), Arabic (*raḥiba/raḥuba,* "be broad, wide," II "greet" [= "make wide the entrance to the tent"?], and other derivatives), Old South Arabic (*rḥbm,* "breadth, width"; *rḥbtn/rḥybm,* "plain, flatland, lowland";[3] cf. Ḥaḍrami *raḥaba,* "part of the wadi through which the water generally runs"[4]), Ethiopic (*raḥba,* "be broad, wide"[5]), Mandaic (*rhb* II, "be broad, wide," shafel also "comfort"[6]), Phoenician (*rḥb*[7]), Ugaritic (*rḥb,* "wide"[8]; *rḥbt,* a kind of "container" — possibly connected[9] with Egyp. *rḥb,* "kind of container";[10] cf. also the place name *rḥbn*[11]).

Doubt has been cast on the formerly widely accepted existence of an Akk. *rēbu,* "wide," on the basis of EA 162:41.[12] No entry *rēbu,* "wide," appears in *AHw,* which

---

rāḥaḇ. C. Barth, *Die Errettung vom Tode in den individuellen Klage- und Dankliedern des ATs* (Stuttgart, ²1987), esp. 91-122; J. M. Sasson, "Reḥōvōt ʿîr," *RB* 90 (1983) 94-96; J. J. Stamm, "Zwei alttestamentliche Königsnamen," *Near Eastern Studies in Honor of W. F. Albright* (Baltimore, 1971), 443-52.

1. M. D. Coogan, *West Semitic Personal Names in the Murašû Documents. HSM* 7 (1976), 83, citing H. V. Hilprecht and A. T. Clay, *Business Documents of Murashû Sons of Nippur Dated in the Reign of Artaxerxes I. Babylonian Expedition of the Univ. of Pennsylvania, Cuneiform Texts* A/9 (Philadelphia, 1898), 69; and *APN,* 305.

2. *KAI,* 222A.10; according to *TSSI,* II, 36-37, possibly a toponym.

3. Biella, 485.

4. *NESE,* I, 80, 140.

5. *LexLingAeth,* 273-74.

6. *MdD,* 426.

7. *DISO,* 276; *KAI,* 26A.1,4.

8. M. Dahood, *RSP,* I, 160; *UT,* no. 2317, with meaning given as uncertain.

9. W. A. Ward, *JNES* 20 (1961) 40.

10. *WbÄS,* II, 442.

11. See also M. Astour, *RSP,* II, 329, 361.

12. *KBL²,* 883, although the reading in the EA text is in fact *ra'ābu* (cf. A. Rainey, *El Amarna Tablets Sup. AOAT* 8 [1978], 87 n. 8, no. 1493, which cites the lexeme as *ra'ābu* II alongside *ra'ābu* I; the suggested translation, which goes back to E. Ebeling, is given a question mark) and the interpretation of the passage is not uniform in the translation (see J. Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln,* 2 vols. [Leipzig, repr. 1964]; cf. 1:657 with 2:1268).

cites EA 162:41 under *ra'ābu(m),* "tremble, be angry."[13] Furthermore, with regard to the etymology of *r^eḥôḇ, AHw* does not agree with *KBL*² and earlier scholarship, which assumed a connection between Akk. *rebītu(m)* and Heb. *r^eḥôḇ.* In this latter instance, although the semantic correspondence is certain (as many texts show, both lexemes denote, *inter alia,* city squares), *AHw* derives *rebītu(m),* "quadrilateral, (city) square; abdomen," from *rēbû,* "fourth, quarter," not from the verb *rēbu* posited by earlier scholars — without explaining, however, how the meaning "abdomen" might relate to "four."[14] In the case of *rēbu, AHw* is clearly correct in the light of the uncertain textual evidence; in the case of *rebītu(m),* however, in view of the clear semantic correspondence, the older theory must at least be left open for discussion. It is true that West Semitic *ḥ* usually corresponds to Akk. *ḫ,* but the examples cited by Brockelmann together with one discussed by Coogan show that the etymology proposed by earlier scholars cannot be rejected out of hand.[15]

2. *Occurrences.* The root *rḥb* occurs 198 times in the Hebrew portion of the OT (not counting a conjectural emendation in Isa. 60:5[16]); it does not appear in the Aramaic portion, where the synonymous root *pth* appears only as the noun *p^eṯāy,* "breadth." There are an additional 74 instances of the root in proper names.

As is often true of stative verbs, there are many more nominal than verbal occurrences of the root: 173 occurrences of the root in nominal derivatives contrast with a mere 25 verbal occurrences. Among the latter, the qal occurs once and the niphal 3 times, while the hiphil occurs 21 times. Among the nominal derivatives, the commonest is the *quṭl/qaṭl* form *rōḥaḇ* (101 occurrences)/*raḥaḇ* (2 occurrences, possibly a byform [not in *KBL*²]), "breadth, width"; *r^eḥôḇ,* "open place," occurs 43 times, the adj. *rāḥāḇ,* "broad, wide," 21 times, and the abstract noun *merḥāḇ,* "breadth, open space," 6 times.

Because there are few occurrences of the verb, it is naturally impossible to identify significant concentrations in individual books of the OT. It is worth noting, however, that almost half of the verbal occurrences are in the book of Isaiah (7) and the Psalter (5); the (relative) concentration in the book of Isaiah may be due to a preference for the root *rḥb* on the part of a redactor of "Greater Isaiah."[17]

One can only speculate over the significance of the distribution of the verb among the books of the OT, but the reason for the concentration of the noun *rōḥaḇ* in Ex. 25–40 (22 times), Ezk. 40–48 (55 times), and 1 K. 6–7/2 Ch. 3–6 (16 times) is obvious. All these texts state length, width, and height in the context of giving the dimensions of a building or object; the use of the technical term *rōḥaḇ,* "width," is unavoidable. Other significant concentrations of nominal derivatives of this root cannot be identified.

---

13. *AHw,* II, 932.
14. *Ibid.,* 964-65. See I.3 below.
15. *VG,* I, §45r; Coogan, *Names,* 83.
16. *HAL,* III, 1211.
17. On the concept of "Greater Isaiah" and the problem of multiple redactions of the textual corpus in question, see O. H. Steck, *Bereitete Heimkehr. SBS* 121 (1985), 8, 80, and *passim.*

3. *Meaning.* Assigning the special meaning "open wide" to the qal of the verb is unnecessary;[18] the few occurrences are easy to interpret from the basic meaning "be(come) broad, wide." An analogous claim can be made for the single occurrence of the niphal participle, which can serve as a good example of the demonstrative function of the niphal.[19] A survey of the occurrences of the hiphil arrives at the same conclusion: linkage with a variety of objects lends different nuances to the semantic nucleus "make broad, wide," but nowhere is it necessary to postulate a special or secondary meaning of the root, regardless of whether *hirḥîḇ* is used absolutely, with a direct or indirect object, with or without a marker of the accusative.

The situation of the nominal derivatives is no different; in most cases a direct connection with the postulated semantic nucleus remains clear. Only when the nouns in question are combined with other lexemes (e.g., *reḥaḇ lēḇ,* "arrogant"; *reḥaḇ nepeš,* "greedy") does the connection with the basic meaning become more abstract; for the Hebrew listener, nevertheless, we can assume that it was a living reality.

Five proper names derive from the root *rḥb: rāḥāḇ* (Josh. 2:1,3; 6:17,23,25), *reḥôḇ* I-III (Josh. 19:28,30; 21:31; Jgs. 1:31; 2 S. 8:3,12; 1 Ch. 6:60[Eng. 75]; Neh. 10:12[11]), *reḥōḇôṯ* I-III (Gen. 10:11; 26:22; 36:37; 1 Ch. 1:48), *reḥaḇyā(hû)* (1 Ch. 23:17; 24:21; 26:25), and *reḥaḇʿām* (49 times in 1 K. 11–15/2 Ch. 9–12; once in 1 Ch. 3:10). The first of these is hard to interpret, whereas the meaning of the others can be determined with relative ease. Thus *reḥôḇ* and *reḥaḇyā(hû)* should probably be interpreted as theophorous "thanksgiving" names.[20] Noth's suggestion that the qal used as an element of the name might be understood in the sense of the hiphil, so that the name would mean "the deity has made broad, has made room, has freed," remains dubious, in spite of the analogous popular etymology in Gen. 26:22.[21] Much more likely is his alternative interpretation of *rḥb* on the basis of Modern Heb. *rāḥāḇ,* "generous." Quite apart from Noth, it must be noted that the Arabic expression *raḥb ʾaṣ-ṣadr,* "magnanimous, generous," may also be considered as an etymological parallel, as well as the Arabic greeting *marḥaban.*

The name *reḥaḇʿām,* on the other hand, is probably not a theophorous name; it is to be understood rather as meaning "the nation has expanded."[22] According to Jepsen, it is to be understood in an optative sense.[23]

The meaning of the toponyms *reḥôḇ* and *reḥôḇôṯ* is transparent: they refer in most cases to sites that stand apart from the other congested villages in their immediate vicinity by virtue of their open spaces. (Knippenberg interprets *reḥôḇ* as an abstract meaning "expanse" [confusion with *rōḥaḇ*]; Sasson interprets the expression *ûreḥôḇôṯ*

18. Cf. *HAL,* III, 1211.

19. E. Jenni, *Proceedings of the Fifth World Congress of Jewish Studies,* IV (1973), 64.

20. *IPN,* 193.

21. *Ibid.*

22. Contra F. Knutson, *RSP,* III, 491-92. See *IPN,* 193 n. 4; but cf. A. R. Hulst, *THAT,* I, 292; and Stamm, 445-46.

23. A. Jepsen, *BHHW,* III, 1572, citing W. F. Albright.

ʿîr, despite the copulative *waw,* as a superlative in apposition with Nineveh.[24]) These places were thus named on the principle of "the part for the whole." Only in Gen. 26:22 and 36:37 does *r^eḥôḇôṯ* appear to allude to broad plains (in the latter instance by the Euphrates[25]) rather than city squares.

In the case of the PN *rāḥāḇ,* Noth conjectures that there it has an etiological association with a particular structure in the ruins of Jericho.[26] The phrase *bêṯ rāḥāḇ,* he believes, was originally "an appellative for the brothel," for which the original technical term was *bêt r^eḥôḇ,* "the house on the public square." Much more likely — and ultimately more in line with Noth's own requirement that the name be explained "as naturally as possible from the situation of the naming"[27] — is an interpretation of the name that takes into account both the metier of its bearer and the fictionality of the original narrative:[28] in choosing a name for the "heroine" of the text, its author — rooted in the mentality of the ancient Near East rather than bourgeois morality — clearly chose a (derisive?) name reflecting the woman's position. He not only drew, indirectly, on the sexual connotations implicit in the semantic field of the root ("broad-minded, generous, gratifying")[29] but seems also to have made quite explicit use of the "part for the whole" principle: the lower body of this lady or its dimensions reflecting the ideal of female beauty in the ancient Near East (cf. the innumerable "fat-rumped" feminine idols from this period) became her name. (This explanation lends additional support to the theory mentioned above of an etymological connection between Heb. *r^eḥôḇ* and Akk. *rebītu(m)* in the sense of "lower body."[30])

4. *Semantic Field.* Almost completely synonymous with *rḥb* are *ptḥ* II, probably originally a specifically Aramaic root and attested only once in Biblical Hebrew (Gen. 9:27, hiphil), and *rwḥ* I along with its two nominal derivatives.[31] Semantically close — but more general and hence of greater semantic range, thus in a sense hierarchically superior — is the root *gdl,* sometimes used in the hiphil almost as a synonym, especially when the "enlargement" takes place through expansion of the entity in question. There is also a certain overlap between the lexical fields of *ptḥ* and *rḥb:* the latter focuses on the size or increase in size of an opening, while the former generally denotes the opening of a previously closed object. As a direct antonym we may name *ṣrr* I, which (with its derivatives) is used quite consciously in several psalms as the contrast to *rḥb* and its derivatives; the analogous statement naturally holds true also for the corresponding adjectives. When *rḥb* is used in the spatial, geometrical sense, *ʾrk* also serves as a kind of

24. R. Knippenberg, *BHHW,* III, 1572; Sasson, 96.
25. B. Moritz, *Mus* 50 (1937) 117.
26. M. Noth, *Das Buch Josua. HAT,* VII (^{3}1971), 23.
27. *IPN,* 4.
28. J. P. Floss, *Kunden oder Kundschafter? ATS* 16 (1982); 26 (1986); the attempt of M. A. Beek, *Von Kanaan bis Kerala. FS J. P. M. van der Ploeg. AOAT* 211 (1982), 37, to prove the contrary clearly runs counter to the transmitted text.
29. This phenomenon is discussed by J. B. Hospers, *ZAH* 1 (1988) 32.
30. *AHw,* II, 964; see I.1 above.
31. Distinct from *rwḥ* II according to *GesB,* 741-42; not distinguished by *HAL.*

antonym; the same is true, finally, of *g'h/gbh, 'mq,* and *rwm;* in each case the hiphil in particular demands attention as well as the qal. In the domain of nominal derivatives, accordingly, *rōḥaḇ* together with *'ōreḵ* and *gōḇah/qômâ* (but not *rômâ*) constitute a semantic field serving to describe the spatial features of buildings and objects.

II. Usage. 1. *Verb.* The few occurrences of the verb in the qal already indicate three thematic clusters typical for the OT usage of *rḥb;* these clusters recur in the usage of the hiphil and of the root's nominal derivatives. For example, the qal appears in 1 S. 2:1 and the hiphil in Isa. 57:4; Ps. 35:21; 81:11(10) in conjunction with *peh.*[32] The image of a wide-open mouth (along with that of a raised horn) expresses the advantage of the speaker — who is free to say anything at all without hindrance — over the enemy;[33] but the ability of the enemies to "open wide their mouths" in Isa. 57:4 and Ps. 35:21 stands figuratively for the advantage of the oppressors as perceived by the speaker. Thus the concrete, visible phenomenon of a wide-open mouth becomes an image of a psychological state.

Ps. 81:11(10) stands somewhat apart from this context. The wide-open mouth has to do with words, but here they are the words of Yahweh, which the psalmist is to ingest like a prophet (cf. Ezk. 2:8–3:3) so as to speak them subsequently to others. The "wideness" of the open mouth has more to do with the magnitude of what it must ingest than with a sense of advantage on the part of the speaker.

The verb appears in conjunction with *lēḇ* in Isa. 60:5 (qal) and Ps. 25:17; 119:32 (hiphil). Despite the text-critical problems of Ps. 25:17,[34] the verse plays a key role in our understanding of the root's meaning; for only here — except for Ps. 4:2(1), which does not have *lēḇ* and uses the perfect rather than the imperfect — the hiphil of *rḥb* occurs in the same clause as the antonymous term *ṣār(ôṯ).* The psalmist, whose heart is "constricted" (which may quite well be understood concretely as a kind of angina), prays to Yahweh to give his heart room, i.e., to give him "breathing space" in both the physiological and the psychological sense; the elemental coincidence of the concrete spatial meaning with the abstract meaning is strikingly articulated. In a similar way, the "expansive" heart in Isa. 60:5 has something to do with deliverance from an oppressive situation, the pressure Israel was still under even in the postexilic period. More abstractly, Ps. 119:32 asserts the more general proposition that strict obedience to the commandments of the *tôrâ* has a liberating effect.

These examples represent the variety of meanings the root can convey in theological usage. In Ezk. 41:7 we come to the first instance of the original, unambiguous geometrical usage of *rḥb,* whether we follow the MT or, with Zimmerli and Gese,[35] read the first word of the verse as a noun: the side chambers (or the passageway) in the ideal temple grow wider as they rise from story to story. Isa. 30:33 uses the hiphil of

32. See C. J. Labuschagne, *THAT,* II, 409.

33. R. Bartelmus, *BZ* 31 (1987) 29.

34. See *BHS.*

35. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 377. H. Gese, *Der Verfassungsentwurf des Ezechiel (Kap. 40–48). BHT* 25 (1957), 24.

rḥb in the same way in describing the fire pit prepared for the king of Assyria; the expression (probably a secondary addition) serves to describe the spatial dimensions of this pit.

In the context of Isa. 30:23, where the root appears in the form of a niphal participle, it probably exhibits a semantic breadth similar to that observed when it is used with *lēḇ*. When the text speaks of broad pastures for the cattle, it implies more than just the cattle: behind these words stands the more significant expectation that the people too will soon be able to breathe freely once more, that Israel will no longer be oppressed by enemies.

Other passages where *rḥb* appears in the hiphil point in the same direction. In the military imagery of 2 S. 22:37 = Ps. 18:37(36), it is the psalmist's steps to which Yahweh has given a wide place, but the clause naturally means also that the psalmist has been delivered from the oppression of the enemy. The hiphil may also convey this sense without a direct object (Gen. 26:22; Dt. 33:20 [with Isaac and Gad benefiting from the result]) or with the dir. obj. *g^eḇûl* (Ex. 34:24; Dt. 12:20; 19:8) or *m^eqôm 'oh^olēḵ* (Isa. 54:2). Territorial expansion of the state, prophesied or achieved — described by understatement in Isa. 54:2 as a site for Israel's "tent" — represents at the same time deliverance from enemy oppression, as Gen. 26:22 makes explicit in its etiology of the toponym Rehoboth. Am. 1:13, by contrast, assesses Ammon's attempt to expand its territory negatively, probably not just because of its accompanying brutality; it is significant that the polysemy of the term noted elsewhere is not present here.

The argumentation in Prov. 18:16 is deceptive in a very different use of multiple meanings: the "scope" that one gets through gifts has a concrete spatial component — one gains access to those who exercise power in this world; primarily, however, the point is deliverance from burdensome legal restrictions that stand in the way of personal advancement.[36]

The remaining four passages that use the hiphil of *rḥb* primarily in a spatial sense all stand in clearly negative contexts. Its use with *miškāḇ* as object in Isa. 57:8 is a periphrastic reference to fornication (possibly an additional nuance influencing the choice of the PN Rahab in Josh. 2 and 6). In Mic. 1:16 the command to "extend" the existing "minor tonsure" to total baldness as a sign of absolute mourning brings to a climax the prophecies of disaster for the cities of Judah.[37] It is safe to assume that the language also alludes to the extension of this disaster to all Judah. Finally, when the text speaks of *š^e'ôl* (Isa. 5:14) opening its mouth beyond measure or a robber opening his throat as wide as *š^e'ôl* (Hab. 2:5), the mythological image represents the magnitude of the coming disaster.

2. *rōḥaḇ/raḥaḇ*. From the theological perspective, the nominal instances of the root are less interesting. This holds true particularly for the 103 occurrences of the noun *rōḥaḇ (raḥaḇ)*, used primarily in the technical sense in descriptions of the width of ob-

---

36. H. Ringgren, *Sprüche*. *ATD* XVI/1 (^{3}1980), 75.
37. H. W. Wolff, *Micah* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1990), 64.

jects.[38] In Ex. 25–40, e.g., the word appears in the dimensions of the ark (25:10; 37:1), the *kappōreṯ* (25:17; 37:6), the table for the bread of the Presence (25:23; 37:10), the curtains (26:2,8; 36:9,15), the frames (26:16; 36:21), the altars (27:1; 30:2; 37:25; 38:1), and the outer court (27:12,13,18) together with the screen at its entrance (38:18) in the Sinaitic tabernacle, as well as the breastpiece attached to the priestly ephod (28:16; 39:9). In 1 K. 6–7 par. 2 Ch. 3–6, by contrast, the word refers to the width of the Solomonic temple as a whole (1 K. 6:2 par. 2 Ch. 3:3,4), as well as the width of its vestibule (1 K. 6:3) and side chambers (6:6), its inner sanctuary (6:20 par. 2 Ch. 3:8) and altar (2 Ch. 4:1), the stands for the molten sea (1 K. 7:27), and the platform in the outer court (2 Ch. 6:13), as well as the width of the House of the Forest of Lebanon (1 K. 7:2) and the Hall of Pillars in Solomon's palace (7:6).

Finally, Ezk. 40 describes the new Jerusalem and its temple precincts. The extreme concentration of the term in this chapter doubtless has something to do with the fact that it is dealing with dimensions decreed from on high, so that any possible confusion (e.g., of length with width) must be avoided. Besides length and height, which are irrelevant here, the text thus states precisely the width of walls (40:5; 41:2,5,9,12), thresholds (40:6), recesses (40:7), gates (40:11,13,20,21,25,29,33,36,48; 41:2,3), courts (40:19,47; 46:22), vestibules (40:30,49), the nave (41:1) and the most holy place (41:4), pilasters (41:1), chambers (41:10,11), and passages (42:4,11), as well as the width of the whole complex with its various parts (41:12,14; 42:2,11,20) and installations (40:42; 43:13,14,16,17). It describes analogously the sections of the reapportioned land allotted to the temple (45:1,3; 48:8-9) and the holy city (45:6; 48:15) as well as to the Levites (45:5; 48:13) and priests (48:10). We also find unquantified references to the width of structures (41:7; 42:10).

Of the remaining 10 passages, 9 also employ *rōḥaḇ* in a technical spatial sense, describing the width of objects (Gen. 6:15 [the ark]; Dt. 3:11 [Og's coffin]; Zec. 5:2 [a scroll]) or geographical entities (Gen. 13:17 [the land of Canaan]; Isa. 8:8 [the land of Immanuel]; Zec. 2:6[2] [Jerusalem]; Job 36:16; 37:10; 38:18 [open space, water, and the earth]). Only 1 K. 5:9(4:29), which speaks of Solomon's "breadth of understanding,"[39] uses *rōḥaḇ* in a sense that is not purely spatial; here the concrete *tertium comparationis,* the sand of the sea, appears to have influenced the choice of the word in an unusual context.

3. *r^eḥôḇ*. The noun *r^eḥôḇ* is of equally slight theological relevance; except in toponyms, the OT uses it exclusively as a technical term in the realm of municipal architecture. Its relatively frequent occurrence in late postexilic texts is probably connected with the Persian and Hellenistic promotion of urban culture.[40] Except in 2 Ch. 29:4, where the eastern court of the temple appears as *r^eḥôḇ,* the term invariably denotes city squares, by implication the place or — in the case of major cities — place within the

38. See I.2 above.

39. E. Würthwein, *Könige I. ATD* XI/1 (^{2}1985), 48.

40. J. P. Weinberg, *ZAW* 98 (1986) 72-95; he finds an "urban orientation" on the part of the Chronicler.

city devoted to public life (cf. the Greek agora). These are places where people meet (Est. 4:6; Dnl. 9:25), whether an assembly of the people has been called (Ezr. 10:9; Neh. 8:1,3,16; 2 Ch. 32:6) or people have gathered spontaneously, e.g., to hear a speaker (Prov. 1:20; similarly Job 29:7). This is the place where old men and women gather to talk and children to play (Zec. 8:4-5), where public lamentation takes place (Isa. 15:3; Jer. 48:38; Am. 5:16; Ps. 144:14), where a person is presented for public honor (Est. 6:9,11) or disgrace (2 S. 21:12), and where one might hope to meet a person not in his or her usual place (Cant. 3:2; negated, Jer. 5:1). Prostitutes also commonly entice customers in public squares (Ezk. 16:24,31; Prov. 7:12; figuratively, Prov. 5:16); therefore those who spend the night in such a place run the danger of being considered "fair game" in the sexual sense (Gen. 19:2; Jgs. 19:15,17,20).

When besieging a town, the first thing the enemy does is to bring the main square under fire, thus bringing public life to a halt (Lam. 4:18);[41] if the town is captured, troops are stationed there as a sign of victory (Nah. 2:5[4]). (It is against this background that Dt. 13:17[16] should be interpreted: if a town that has rejected Yahweh is recaptured for Yahweh by the rest of Israel, its spoil is commanded to be gathered into the public square, to be burned along with the whole town.) Because the main square symbolizes a town's independence, the best troops are stationed — and die — there in its defense (Jer. 9:20[21]; 49:26; 50:30). When the victorious army withdraws, the survivors gather there to beg for food or to die for lack of it (Lam. 2:11-12).

It may remain an open question whether to interpret this last passage figuratively; it is clear, however, that we must interpret Prov. 22:13; 26:13; Isa. 59:14; and Ps. 55:12(11) in a figurative sense. In the Proverbs texts the *rᵉḥôḇôṯ* represent the public arena, to which fools refuse to commit their energy; the last two state that in the public square, which stands figuratively for the totality of public life, "uprightness" and "truth" meet defeat, "oppression and fraud" are rampant.

4. *rāḥāḇ*. The situation differs in the case of *rāḥāḇ*. This inherently secular term is also common in theologically relevant contexts, with two distinct senses. In connection with divine activity, it describes the potential of God, which is longer than the earth and broader than the sea, i.e., all-embracing (Job 11:9).[42] Similarly all-embracing is the effectuality of Yahweh's *tôrâ,* which, unlike the afflictions that beset the psalmist, knows no bounds (Ps. 119:96). An illustration of how this all-embracing divine potential is realized is the ability of the psalmist, who observes the *tôrâ,* to walk "on broad ground," i.e., at liberty (Ps. 119:45), despite the machinations of the enemy; another is Yahweh's promise to Israel that he will lead the people out of tribulation in Egypt into a good and broad land (Ex. 3:8; Neh. 9:35).

In contrast to this usage and our observations concerning the verb,[43] when *rāḥāḇ* together with another noun is used to describe human qualities or other earthly matters, it

41. H.-J. Kraus, *Klagelieder. BK* XX (³1983), 81.
42. F. Horst, *Hiob. BK* XVI/1 (³1983), 163.
43. See II.1 above.

usually conveys a negative sense. A person who is *reḥab lēb* or *reḥab nepeš* ("haughty," or better [in the latter case] "greedy"[44]) is shunned by the upright (Ps. 101:5), commits sin (Prov. 21:4), and stirs up strife (Prov. 28:25). Neither is the image of the wide breach (in Job's house? Job 30:14), the description of Babylon as broad (Jer. 51:58), or the prophecy of Oholibah's deep and wide cup (Ezk. 23:32) to be understood in a positive sense. Job has reason to complain that his enemies advance on him as through a wide breach; despite its immense size, Babylon must be razed; and Oholibah must drink to the dregs this wide cup (of Yahweh's wrath).

That the adjective can nevertheless be used in a neutral sense is clear from its basic meaning. Thus Neh. 3:8; 12:38; and 4:13 speak quite neutrally of the broad walls of Jerusalem and the great distances separating the defenders of these walls. In conjunction with *yāḏayim* it can describe the extent of a region (Gen. 34:21; Jgs. 18:10; Isa. 22:18; 1 Ch. 4:40) or a city (Neh. 7:4) in two dimensions. We find analogous usage in the case of rivers (Isa. 33:21) and the sea (Ps. 104:25). Since three of these texts speak of Yahweh or God as the author of this breadth (Jgs. 18:10; Isa. 33:21; Ps. 104:25), it would also be possible to include them in the category of positive theological usage of the adjective. We have shown, however, that positive or negative connotations are not inherent in the lexeme itself but are evoked by the particular context; we can therefore let stand the categorization based on formal criteria.

5. *merḥāḇ*. A survey of the few occurrences of the abstract noun *merḥāḇ* ("expanse"; NRSV "a broad place") closes the circle of theological observations on the usage of the root *rḥb*. When the speaker in Ps. 18:20(19) par. 2 S. 22:20 says that Yahweh has brought him out into an "expanse," this formula stands figuratively for Yahweh's act of deliverance from affliction — not by accident does the catchword *ṣār* appear previously (Ps. 18:7[6] par. 2 S. 22:7). Ps. 31:9(8) is similar: the "expanse" in which the psalmist's feet have been set means freedom from affliction (cf. v. 8[7]); in Ps. 118:5 *merḥāḇ* seems almost to have become a technical term for Yahweh's potential to set free.

By contrast, Hos. 4:16 appears to use *merḥāḇ* in a relatively neutral sense in describing the broad pasture of the lamb. The context, however, which speaks of Israel as a stubborn heifer that should not be allowed to roam free, makes clear that the choice of words must be seen against the background of the texts discussed above.[45] The text focuses on the freedom that Yahweh originally granted Israel, of which Israel has proved unworthy. Only Hab. 1:6 shows that *merḥāḇ,* too, is not inherently a technical theological term: this derivative of the root can also be used neutrally in the geographical sense of "breadth."

III. 1. *LXX.* In translating *rḥb* and its derivatives, the LXX shows a preference for lexemes derived from the almost synonymous root **plat-: (dia-/em-)platýnein, plátos,*

---

44. For "haughty" see *HAL,* III, 1212; H.-P. Stähli, *THAT,* I, 381, 396. For "greedy," see C. Westermann, *THAT,* II, 76-77.

45. J. Jeremias, *Hosea. ATD,* XXIV/1 (1983), 72, contra H. W. Wolff, *Hosea. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1974), 91.

plateía, platýs. It is noteworthy that the LXX never uses *agorá* to translate *r^eḥôḇ,* using instead the more "literal" translation *plateía* or, to capture the meaning, such other terms as *(di-)odós* ("street"), *épaulis* ("street" or "village," Ps. 144:14), *klítos* ("side," 2 Ch. 29:4 — clearly the translator knew nothing of any square on the east side of the temple), or *rhýmē* ("street": Isa. 15:3). In addition — especially in descriptions of structures — the LXX often employs the root **eur-,* as in *eúros* or (more rarely) *eurýcōros/-chōría.*

The other LXX equivalents usually appear only once and serve to provide a more precise translation. This is particularly true in the case of *chýma kardías* ("broad-mindedness") for *rōḥaḇ lēḇ* in 1 K. 5:9 and *áplēstos* ("insatiable") for *r^eḥaḇ lēḇ* in Prov. 21:4 and *r^eḥaḇ nep̱eš* in Ps. 101:5; Prov. 28:25; it is also true of *ábyssos* ("netherworld"), even though its use in Job 36:16 appears to be an instance of overinterpretation. In the case of *amétrētos* (Isa. 22:18), *anoígein* (57:4), *existán* (60:5), and *polýs* (Ex. 3:8), we are dealing with translations that capture the meaning of the original and need no further explanation.

2. *Sirach.* Sir. 47:23 adds an interesting variant to the list of OT construct phrases using *r^eḥaḇ:* the text introduces Rehoboam as *r^eḥaḇ 'iwwelet,* "broad in folly," probably in the sense of "fathead,"[46] because his conduct literally led his people to revolt.

3. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* The occurrences of the root in the Dead Sea Scrolls provide little new information beyond the usage observed in the OT, especially since many of them appear in fragmentary texts (1QH 12:1 [reading disputed]; 4Q179 fr. 1, 1:9 [the squares of Jerusalem]; 4Q184 fr. 6, 1; 4Q186 fr. 1, 1:5; 4Q491 fr. 12, 3; 4Q517 fr. 19, 1). Other occurrences, in the Temple Scroll, exhibit a technical usage analogous to that in Ezk. 40–48 (11QT 4:3,7; 7:10; 30:7,9; 31:11,13; 32:9; 33:12; 36:4,6,8; 38:12ff.; 40:7,9,12; 41:14; 42:02,04,05,1,3,4; 46:5,9); the texts deal with the width of walls, courts, gates, chambers, pilasters, and terraces within the temple area and the width of the ditch surrounding it.

The fragment 4Q487 fr. 15, 3 recalls the OT use of the root with *peh* but provides no new information. The same is true of 11QT 53:07 (reconstructed) and 55:9, which appear to be based on Dt. 12:20 and 13:17(16), respectively, and of 4Q184 fr. 1, 12, which appears to reflect Prov. 7:12 (5:16).

The OT evidence is also confirmed by 11QPs^a 22:5,18; 1QS 4:9; and 1QH 9:27. The first of these texts, an apostrophe to Zion, speaks of the marvelous squares of Jerusalem where people can (once more) stroll (?); shortly before the end of this "Hymn to Zion," the psalmist's hopes for Jerusalem are summarized in a series of imperatives, including the request that Zion may be not only "lofty" but also "broad," probably to be understood as in the sense of "free," in line with the usage of the root elsewhere in the Psalms. In 1QS 4:9 a list of the types of conduct typical of the "spirit of wickedness" includes the combination of *rḥb* with *nep̱eš* found in Prov. 28:25; here, however, *rḥb* is

46. The play on words is discussed by G. Sauer, *JSHRZ,* III/5, 625.

in the form of an infinitive rather than an adjective. That the expression means "greedy" or "greed" is clear. Finally, 1QH 9:27 provides a further instance of the usage of greatest theological interest, the contrast of *rḥb* with *ṣrr,* although in this case we find *r*ᵉ*ḥôḇ* rather than a verbal form or the noun *merḥāḇ* as in the OT (*r*ᵉ*ḥôḇ* being simply a scribal variant of *rōḥaḇ,* typical of the Qumran texts[47]). Although there are gaps in the text, it is clear that the speaker thanks God for "everlasting expanse," i.e., general "liberation" from all afflictions, in accord with the usage (noted several times in this discussion) in comparable "individual thanksgivings."

Bartelmus

47. M. Baillet, *Qumrân grotte 4.III. DJD,* VII (1982), 8.

רחם *rḥm;* רַחֲמִים *raḥ*ᵃ*mîm;* רַחוּם *raḥûm;* רַחֲמָנִי *raḥ*ᵃ*mānî*

I. 1. Semitic; 2. LXX; 3. Occurrences. II. Verb: 1. Piel; 2. Qal; 3. Pual. III. Nouns: 1. *raḥ*ᵃ*mîm;* 2. *raḥûm;* 3. *raḥ*ᵃ*mānî.* IV. Summary. V. Dead Sea Scrolls: 1. Verb; 2. *raḥ*ᵃ*mîm;* 3. Adjective.

rḥm. G. J. Botterweck, "Sei mir gnädig, Jahwe, nach deiner Güte," *BiLe* 2 (1961) 136-42; J. Chmiel, "Une approche sémiotique de RḤM," *Analecta Cracoviensia* 16 (1984) 389-93; M. Dahood, "Denominative *riḥḥam* 'to conceive, enwomb,'" *Bibl* 44 (1963) 204-5; R. C. Dentan, "The Literary Affinities of Exodus XXXIV 6f.," *VT* 13 (1963) 34-51; D. N. Freedman, "God Compassionate and Gracious," *Western Watch* 6 (1955) 6-24; E. Jacob, "L'héritage cananéen dans le livre du prophète Osée," *RHPR* 43 (1963) 250-59; A. Jepsen, "Gnade und Barmherzigkeit im AT," *KuD* 7 (1961) 261-71; P. Jouön, "L'idée de pitié en hébreu," *Bibl* 6 (1925) 51-52; C. Levin, "Der Dekalog am Sinai," *VT* 35 (1985) 165-91; M. Liverani, "Un'ipòtesi sul nome di Abramo," *Henoch* 1 (1979) 9-18; E. C. MacLaurin, "The Semitic Background of Use of *'en splanchnois,'*" *PEQ* 103 (1971) 42-45; I. Matsuda, "The Structure of Mental Activities in Biblical Hebrew," *AJBI* 2 (1976) 79-99; Y. Muffs, "Joy and Love as Metaphorical Expressions of Willingness and Spontaneity in Cuneiform, Ancient Hebrew, and Related Literature," in J. Neusner, ed., *Christianity, Judaism, and Other Greco-Roman Cults. FS M. Smith* (Leiden, 1975), 3:1-36; P.-H. Plamondon, "Sur le chemin du salut avec le IIᵉ Isaïe," *NRT* 104 (1982) 241-266; H. D. Preuss et al., "Barmherzigkeit," *TRE,* V, 215-38; G. Rendsburg, "Hebrew *rḥm* = 'rain,'" *VT* 33 (1983) 357-62; G. Rinaldi, "רחם," *BiOr* 15 (1973) 237-38; *idem,* "Studi italiani sul testo ebraico anticotestamentario," *BiOr* 22 (1980) 55-61; J. Scharbert, "Formgeschichte und Exegese von Ex 34,6f. und seiner Parallelen," *Bibl* 38 (1957) 130-50; A. Schenker, *Der Mächtige im Schmelzofen des Mitleids. OBO* 42 (1982); H. H. Schmid, "Gerechtigkeit und Barmherzigkeit im AT," *WuD* 12 (1973) 31-41; L. Schmidt, *De Deo. BZAW* 143 (1976), esp. 89-102; G. Schmuttermayr, "Exkurs: Belege für die Verwendung von akkad. *ra'āmu/râmu,*" *Bibl* 51 (1970) 526-32; *idem,* "*RḤM* eine lexikalische Studie," *Bibl* 51 (1970) 499-525; H. Spieckermann, "'Barmherzig und gnädig ist der

I. 1. *Semitic.* The root *rḥm* is common to all Semitic languages. In Akkadian it appears as *rêmu,* which means both "compassion" and "womb."[1] The verb *ra'āmu/râmu,* "be devoted, attached, loyal; love," occasionally "be benevolent, merciful," is probably not associated etymologically with *rḥm;* the form *a-ra-aḫ-am,* which appears in Amarna texts, may be just an orthographic variant of the normal form *a-ra-a'-am.*[2]

In Ugaritic, *rḥm* (verb, "show compassion," or substantive used attributively, "compassionate, loving") appears only rarely.[3] The form *rḥmy* appears occasionally as a title or alternative name for the goddess 'Anat.[4] The meaning of *rḥm* in another text is disputed;[5] it may mean "(female) slave, servant," deriving from *rḥm,* "womb," a usage possibly analogous to Jgs. 5:30, *rḥm rḥmtym,* "a girl or two (taken in war)."

In Old Aramaic the form *rḥm* in Sefire 3.8 may be a participle ("everyone who is well-disposed toward me").[6] In Imperial Aramaic the verb *rḥm* occurs several times in a legal formula with the meaning "wish" and frequently in the Aramaic version of Ahiqar with a variety of meanings: "love, accept (someone), be thankful, be satisfied (with someone)."[7] The subst. *rḥm* means "love, affection,"[8] and the adj. *rḥmn* "kind,"[9] "compassionate, pleasing, acceptable."[10] The expression *brḥmh* should probably be translated "for love," i.e., "gratis, as a gift."[11] In Biblical Aramaic, *rḥmyn* (pl.) means "mercy, pity" (Dnl. 2:18).

In Nabatean and Palmyrene the subst. *rḥm(')* means "affection," the noun or qal participle "friend, someone to whom one is bound by affection," and the adj. *rḥym* both "beloved" and "loving."[12] The last form also occurs at Hatra with both the active meaning "lover, protector" and the passive meaning "beloved, protected."[13] In Jewish and

---

Herr . . .,'" *ZAW* 102 (1990) 1-18; H. J. Stoebe, "Die Bedeutung des Wortes ḤÄSÄD im AT," *VT* 2 (1952) 244-54; *idem,* "רחם *rḥm* pi., sich erbarmen," *THAT,* II, 761-68; P. Trible, *God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality. OBT* (1978); N. J. Tromp, "Harmonie van contrasten" (diss., Utrecht, 1980); S. Tułodziecki, "La notion *raḥᵃmîm* dans l'AT" (diss., Warsaw, 1982); F. E. Wilms, "Du bist ein Gott voller Vergebung (Neh 9,17)," *Lebendiges Zeugnis* 30 (1975) 5-21; J. Ziegler, *Die Liebe Gottes bei den Propheten. ATA* 11/3 (1930).

1. *AHw,* II, 970-71.
2. Schmuttermayr, 509-15.
3. *UT,* no. 2320; *WUS,* no. 2501, 2502; G. Del Olmo Lete, *Mitos y leyendas de Canaán según la tradición de Ugarit. Fuentes de la Ciencia Biblica* 1 (Madrid, 1981), 623.
4. *CML*², 157, "merciful"; *UT,* no. 2321; *WUS,* no. 2503.
5. *KTU,* 1.6, II, 27.
6. *KAI,* 224.8. See J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire. BietOr* 19 (1967), 96, 111; *KAI,* II, 264, 268; cf. also Sefire I.B.42 (*KAI,* 222B.42); A. Dupont-Sommer, *Les inscriptions araméennes de Sfiré* (Paris, 1958), 62, 64; A. Lemaire and J.-M. Durand, *Les inscriptions araméennes de Sfiré* (Geneva, 1984), 125.
7. For "wish" see *DISO,* 277. For Ahiqar see *DISO,* 276-77; *AP,* 220-21, 223, 225.
8. *DISO,* 277; *AP,* 113.
9. *AP,* 221.
10. *DISO,* 278.
11. *DISO,* 278; *AP,* 145.
12. *DISO,* 276-77.
13. *KAI,* 240.2; 242.4; 246.3; 249.8; 251.5.

Palestinian Aramaic the pael of *rḥm* expresses active compassion.[14] In Syriac, *rḥm* has the same three meanings as in Aramaic: "show compassion, love, wish."

The form *rḥmt* appears in Moabite; interpreted as a plural, it apparently means "female slaves" (cf. Jgs. 5:30).[15]

Arab. *raḥima* means "have mercy, have pity, forgive, be tenderhearted."[16] The adjs. *raḥmān* and *raḥīm* describe God's compassion toward all humanity and nonbelievers, respectively. The subst. *raḥmat* denotes both gratuitous mercy and God's reward for human good deeds. The root *rḥm* is also attested in the South Semitic languages Tigriña, Tigre, Harari, and Geʿez ("have compassion/mercy").[17]

2. *LXX.* The LXX usually uses *agapán* to translate the qal of *rḥm;* for the piel it uses *eleeín* (19 times plus Sir. 36:17), *oikteírein* (12 times plus Sir. 36:18), *agapán* (3 times), *éleos* (twice), as well as *eleán, híleōs,* and *parakaleín* (once each). For the pual it uses *eleeín* (5 times) and *agapán* (once). The subst. **raḥam* is represented 28 times by *oiktirmós* and 7 times by *éleos.* The noun *mḗtra* represents *raḥam/reḥem* a total of 22 times. Other translations of *raḥam* are *énkaton, eleeín, énteron, érōs, paidíon* (Isa. 46:3), *splánchna* (Prov. 12:10), and *cháris* (Gen. 43:14; cf. Dnl. 1:9 LXX; Sir. 3:18). The pl. *raḥᵃmîm* is represented by *éleos* (Dnl. 9:18) and *oiktirmós* (Sir. 5:6). The adj. *oiktírmōn* represents *raḥûm* 12 times (and *raḥᵃmānî* in Lam. 4:10), which is also represented by *eleḗmōn* (Sir. 37:11; Ps. 145:8). The PN *raḥam* (1 Ch. 2:44) is transliterated as *Ráem.*

3. *Occurrences.* The verb *rḥm* occurs 49 times in the Hebrew MT: once in the qal, 42 times in the piel, and 6 in the pual. Of the piel occurrences, 6 are in the historical books (2 each in Exodus and Deuteronomy and once each in 1-2 Kings), 31 in the prophets (5 in Isaiah, 6 in Deutero-Isaiah, once in Trito-Isaiah, 10 in Jeremiah, 4 in Hosea, 2 in Zechariah, and once each in Ezekiel, Micah, and Habakkuk), 4 in the Psalms, and once in Lamentations. The pual occurs 5 times in Hosea and once in Proverbs. There are 39 occurrences of *raḥᵃmîm:* 13 in the historical books (5 in Nehemiah, 2 each in Genesis and 1 Kings, once each in Deuteronomy, 2 Samuel, and 1-2 Chronicles), 11 in the Psalms, and once each in Proverbs and Lamentations. The noun *raḥûm* occurs 13 times: 6 times in the Psalms, twice in Nehemiah, and once each in Exodus, Deuteronomy, 2 Chronicles, Joel, and Jonah. The adj. *raḥᵃmānî* appears only in Lam. 4:10.

II. Verb. 1. *Piel.* a. *Syntax.* The piel of *rḥm* (inf., prefix conjugation, suffix conjugation, and ptcp.) appears 16 times with a suffix as object, 9 times with an object introduced by *'eṯ* (3 times with the object preceding the verb), and 5 times with an object without *'eṯ* (3 times with the verb preceding the object). It appears without an object 6

---

14. Jastrow, II, 1467-68; cf. Levy, *WTM,* IV, 439.

15. *KAI,* 181.17; cf. II, 169, 176.

16. Lane, I/3, 1055.

17. See Y. Gabra Egziabeḥêr, *Ethiopian Dictionary Tigriña-Amharic* (Asmara, 1948); *WbTigre;* W. Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Geʿez* (Wiesbaden, 1987), 336.

times and with the prep. *'al* twice (Ps. 103:13). In one text (Jer. 31:20) the infinitive is used adverbially; in another (Hab. 3:2) it governs another verb in a hendiadys. The ptcp. *m^eraḥēm* appears once as an attributive adjective.[18]

The subject of *rḥm* piel is often Yahweh. A few texts have other subjects: oppressors (1 K. 8:50), the Medes and Babylonians (Isa. 13:18), the king of Babylon (Jer. 21:7; 42:12), the "enemy from the north" (Jer. 6:23; 50:42). In Isa. 49:15 the subject is a mother, in Ps. 103:13a a father, but in both metaphors the real subject is Yahweh. The normal recipient of the compassion or mercy expressed by *rḥm* piel is the people of Israel as such, or more narrowly Jacob (Isa. 14:1), Ephraim (Jer. 31:20), the house of Israel and Judah (Hos. 1:6,7), the house of Israel (Ezk. 39:25), the house of Judah and Joseph (Zec. 10:6), the tents of Jacob (Jer. 30:18), Jerusalem and the mountains of Judah (Zec. 1:12), or Zion (Ps. 102:14[Eng. 13]). Only in Jer. 12:15 are Israel's neighbors the beneficiaries of *rḥm.* The "wicked" in Isa. 55:7 appear to belong to the people of Israel, of whom Deutero-Isaiah is thinking. In Ex. 33:19 *w^eriḥamtî 'eṯ '^ašer '^araḥēm* has universal scope, although the purpose of the text is to emphasize the absolute freedom of Yahweh in his revelation.

Lack of compassion reaches an extreme when the enemy show no mercy even to orphans, widows (Isa. 9:16[17]), or small children (13:18).

The piel of *rḥm* is particularly common in emphatic constructions. Only in Isa. 49:15 is the piel infinitive governed by another verb *(h^atiškaḥ mēraḥēm).*[19] In 49:10 and 54:10 the participle serves as a title of Yahweh; as such, it plays a secondary function in the verse. In Isa. 54:8; Hos. 1:6,7; 2:6,25(4,23), *rḥm* has a single object. The emphatic constructions are characterized by either a repeated occurrence of the verb in the same verse (Ex. 33:19 [suffix/prefix conjugation]; Jer. 31:20 [infinitive/prefix]; Ps. 103:13 [infinitive/suffix]), synonymous parallelism (merciless/cruel, Jer. 6:23; 50:42; *rḥm/ḥnn,* Isa. 27:11; 30:18; Ps. 102:14[13]; 116:5; *rḥm/slḥ,* Isa. 55:7; *rḥm/nḥm,* Isa. 49:13; *rḥm/śmḥ* [cj.], Isa. 9:16[17]), or antithetical parallelism (*nkh/rḥm,* Isa. 60:10; *ygh/rḥm,* Lam. 3:32 *Q*). In the combination *šwb/rḥm* (Jer. 12:15; 33:26), *rḥm* expresses a concrete action in the context of a more general category: bringing Israel's neighbors and Israel itself back to the homeland.

In 14 texts *rḥm* appears as one member of a series comprising three or more verbs with the same subject — in 11 instances Yahweh. In Isa. 14:1 *(rḥm/bḥr/nwḥ)* and Mic. 7:19 (*rḥm/kbš/šlk* hiphil), *rḥm* comes first, followed by two promises of election (Isaiah) and forgiveness (Micah). In 6 texts *rḥm* comes second in a series that may be either positive (Dt. 30:3, *šwb/rḥm/qbṣ;* 2 K. 13:23, *ḥnn/rḥm/pnh;* Jer. 30:18, *šwb/rḥm/bnh* niphal; Jer. 42:12, *ntn raḥ^amîm/rḥm/šwb* hiphil; Ezk. 39:25, *šwb* hiphil/*rḥm/qn'*) or negative (Isa. 13:18, *rṭš/lō' rḥm/lō' ḥws*). In Hab. 3:2 *rḥm* occupies the third place in an admonition that includes the verbs *ḥyh* piel and *yd'* hiphil. In five texts *rḥm* occurs in a series of four or more verbs, coming in third (Dt. 13:18[17], *šwb mēḥ^arôn 'appô/ntn raḥ^amîm/rḥm/rbh* hiphil) or fourth place (Jer. 13:14, *npṣ/lō' ḥml/lō' ḥws/lō' rḥm;* Jer.

18. See II.1.b below for a discussion of Isa. 49:15.

19. But see II.1.b below.

21:7, *nkh/lō' ḥws/lō' ḥml/lō' rḥm,* both in a context of punishment; Zec. 10:6, *gbr/yšʿ/šwb* hiphil [cj.]/*rḥm,* in a context of punishment). Finally, in 1 K. 8:50 *rḥm* stands in fifth place, concluding the apodosis of a conditional statement that begins in v. 49 and gives voice to Solomon's petition concerning the function of the temple: "Then you will hear . . . their prayer, maintain their cause, forgive your people . . . , and grant them compassion *(ntn raḥᵃmîm)* . . . , so that [their captors] may have mercy *(rḥm)* on them."

b. *Attribute of Yahweh.* The root *rḥm* appears in a few texts that express Yahweh's own nature. Ex. 33:19 is the beginning of Yahweh's answer to Moses' request to be shown Yahweh's glory (v. 18), immediately before Yahweh's refusal (v. 20) to allow anyone to see his face.[20] God's revelation will consist in vouchsafing to Moses all good things, allowing Moses to call on Yahweh's name — on the basis of Yahweh's proclamation of his own name to Moses — and standing ready to restore by means of *ḥnn* and *rḥm* the broken relationship between humanity and God. Thus *rḥm* is an essential constituent of the relationship between God and humanity, exercised by Yahweh with absolute freedom.

Other texts suggest its nature. Isa. 54:8 and 60:10 use *rḥm* in parallel with *ḥesed ʿôlām* and *rāṣôn,* in contrast to Yahweh's wrath and "hiding his face."[21] Yahweh's wrath can erupt for a moment, but his compassion is eternal, comparable only to the abundance of his steadfast love (*kᵉrōḇ ḥᵃsāḏāyw,* Lam. 3:32 *Q*). Truly "he does not willingly afflict or grieve anyone" (v. 33). The description of Israel as Yahweh's spouse in Isa. 54:4-8 gives the expression overtones of the intimacy that exists between Yahweh and his people, which is restored by *rḥm.*

Because compassion is inherent to Yahweh's nature, its disappearance is conceivable only if the order of human nature and the universe could be overthrown. Only interruption of the natural sequence of day and night could explain how Yahweh could reject his covenant with his people and withdraw his compassion (Jer. 33:26). But even overthrow of the natural order would be easier to understand than alteration of Yahweh's faithfulness to his covenant (Isa. 54:10). Yahweh's compassion is as constant as that of a father for his child (Ps. 103:13) and greater than that of a mother for her son (Isa. 49:15). (Ugaritic and Moabite usage suggest that *mēraḥēm* in Isa. 49:15 should be read as *ʾim* [interrogative in parallel with *hᵃ-*] *raḥam,* "mother, woman," as in Jgs. 5:30, or *mirḥam/mērḥam,* "woman,[22] rather than as an infinitive used as object of the verb *škḥ.* Dahood has proposed reading *mēraḥēm* here and in Jer. 20:17; Job 3:11; Ps. 110:3 as a denominative participle from *reḥem,* "womb." In any case, this text hardly provides a basis for a feminine image of Yahweh.[23])

Along with "gracious" and "righteous" (Ps. 116:5), *mᵉraḥēm,* "merciful," is one of Yahweh's titles; all three express his treatment of the simple and weak (v. 6). Therefor a plea for Yahweh's mercy belongs to the basic repertory of OT prayers. The Psalm of

20. → פנים *pānîm.*
21. → XI, 603-4.
22. For the former see M. I. Gruber, *Tarbiz* 51 (1981/82) 491-92. For the latter see R. Gordis, *Tarbiz* 53 (1983/84) 137-38.
23. R. P. Merendino, *RB* 89 (1982) 331; but see M. I. Gruber, *RB* 90 (1983) 351-59.

Habakkuk (Hab. 3) begins with a supplication that Yahweh will remember his mercy (v. 2). Here this mercy is the precondition that makes it possible for Yahweh to act in such a way as may be best for his people.

In a similar vein the psalmist's distress over the destruction of Jerusalem (Ps. 102:2-12,24-25[1-11,23-24]) can be alleviated only by the assurance that Yahweh will rise up *(qwm)* in royal majesty to establish his favor and compassion (v. 14[13]).

c. *Mitigation of Punishment.* The lexeme *rḥm* can denote the mitigation of a punishment. It is dependent on repentance and faithful return to the laws of Yahweh. Dt. 13:18(17) demands the observance of the law of the ban in the case of a town that has fallen into idolatry, so that God may show compassion *(ntn raḥ^a^mîm)* again and have mercy *(riḥam).* Dt. 30:3 (possibly postexilic because of its similarity in language to Ezk. 16:53; 29:14[24]) is the apodosis of a conditional construction (vv. 1-2) that includes return to God and obedience to God's voice. If Israel accepts these conditions, Yahweh will allow the prisoners to return (*šûḇ š^e^ḇûṯ;* or "restore your fortunes"[?][25]) and gather the dispersed from all the peoples. The expression *w^e^riḥ^a^meḵā* between the two promises appears to summarize them. In 1 K. 8:49-50, too, we have the apodosis of a conditional construction. If the people repent and return to Yahweh, he will hear their prayer, maintain their cause, and forgive them, and they will find compassion in the sight of their captors, so that they may have mercy on them. The compassion shown by the enemy is the result of Yahweh's intervention. A human being (the enemy) is incapable of compassion without divine aid.[26] Although Isa. 55:7 is not formally a conditional construction, it presupposes a change in behavior (the wicked forsake their way and the unrighteous their thoughts, and return to Yahweh), so that Yahweh can "have mercy."

In three passages the changed situation means deliverance from foreign oppression — at the hands of Hazael (2 K. 13:23), the king of Babylon (Jer. 42:12), and an enemy (Babylon) not named explicitly that has sent Judah into exile (Ezk. 39:25). In 2 K. 13:23 the ground for Yahweh's compassion is his remembrance of the covenant; in Ezk. 39:25 it is jealousy for his name. Even the "evil neighbors" of Israel can be the object of compassion, if they "learn the ways of my people," emphasizes Jer. 12:14-15, a postexilic text that provides an exegetical commentary on the promise concerning the restoration of Moab and Ammon (Jer. 48:47; 49:6).[27]

d. *Free Gift of Yahweh.* When the people suffer affliction, *rḥm* can denote the unmerited revelation of Yahweh's benevolence. Thus Jer. 30:18 expresses Yahweh's compassion on the tents of Jacob; here *rḥm* means the building of a new city on the ruins of the old.

The colophon of Micah (Mic. 7:18ff.) contains a double declaration of pardon and the destruction of transgression, iniquity, and sins (vv. 18a,19b), framing an assurance

---

24. N. Mendecki, *BZ* 29 (1985) 267-71; D. Knapp, *Deuteronomium 4. GTA* 35 (1987) 154-57.

25. → שְׁבוּת *š^e^ḇûṯ.*

26. See III.1.b below.

27. W. McKane, *SVT* 32 (1981), 233-36.

that Yahweh will again have compassion (v. 19a). This assurance is developed in v. 20 with the promise to vouchsafe *'ᵉmeṯ* and *ḥeseḏ*.

In four passages the piel of *rḥm* introduced by *kî* is an element of a conditional construction. Confidence that Yahweh will have compassion (Isa. 14:1) and affirm the election of Israel is ultimately the reason that the prophet expects Babylon to be punished (13:19-22). The same belief underlies the promise in Zec. 10:6 that Yahweh will "strengthen, save, and bring back," as well as the confident prediction of Deutero-Isaiah that the return of the poor will be without suffering (Isa. 49:10-13). (Rendsburg's proposed translation of *rḥm* in v. 10 as "send rain" on the basis of South Arabic dialects is neither necessary nor justified.)

In Isa. 30:18 the word *wᵉlāḵēn* inserted before both *ḥnn* and *rḥm* can hardly refer to the preceding threat in vv. 15ff. It is taken up immediately by *kî* in v. 18b. This verse serves as a redactional transition to the oracle of comfort in vv. 19-26.

Trible has aptly recognized the feminine elements in the vocabulary and imagery of Jer. 31, esp. vv. 15-17,21-22.[28] Whether this overtone is also present in v. 20, allowing it to be translated "I will surely show maternal compassion," depends on whether one sees the secondary meaning *reḥem* in every occurrence of the root *rḥm*. Several scholars have expressed skepticism on this point.[29] In any case v. 20 states clearly that Yahweh's compassion is based on nothing other than his own predilection and freedom. He shows compassion because he has turned his attention and love toward its object.

e. *Refusal of rḥm.* When Yahweh refuses to show compassion, his refusal demands a full explanation. According to Isa. 9:11b,16b,20b(12b,17b,21b), the succession of punishments visited upon Ephraim and Samaria have had no effect. The people have not returned to the one who punished them (v. 12[13]). The punishment (inflicted on the young, orphans, and widows) is a consequence of the godlessness of all the people (v. 16a[17a]). The expression *'al-kēn* introduces the avowal that Yahweh will show no mercy.

The oracle against Samaria in Isa. 27:7-11 culminates in the statement that Yahweh will not have compassion on the people (negated *rḥm/ḥnn*) because they have proved themselves incapable of understanding the preceding signs.

Refusal of *rḥm* to the inhabitants of the land, kings, priests, and prophets means the destruction of all.[30] The absence of Yahweh's *rḥm* seems to endure forever. Therefore the "angel" in Zec. 1:12 pleads on behalf of Jerusalem, which has suffered this absence for 70 years.

Hos. 1–2 and 3 together anticipate the message of the prophet (Yahweh torn between love and punishment, pity and pitilessness), articulated on the one hand by the naming and renaming of Gomer's children, on the other by the relationship between Hosea and Gomer, Yahweh and Israel. Lo-ruhamah is given her name because "I

28. Trible, 39-50; see also B. W. Anderson, *CBQ* 40 (1978) 463-78.

29. E.g., Gruber, *RB* 90 (1983) 351-59.

30. W. McKane, *Israelite Wisdom. FS S. Terrien* (Missoula, 1978), 107-20.

[Yahweh] will no longer have pity . . ." (1:6), whereas "I will have pity on the house of Judah" (1:7). Hos. 2:3(1) changes this name: "Call your sister Ruhamah." In changing all three names, 2:25(23) summarizes the promises of faithfulness and fertility given to Israel and to the land: "I will have pity on Lo-ruhamah, and to Lo-ammi I will say 'My people.'" The words *lō' *ᵃraḥēm* (2:6[4]) convey the prophet's threat to have no mercy on Gomer's children.

From enemies one can expect only pitilessness without exception (Jer. 21:7), not even sparing the newborn (Isa. 13:18). The enemy is cruel and merciless (Jer. 6:23; 50:42).

2. *Qal.* There is a single instance of *rḥm* vocalized as a qal (Ps. 18:2[1], *'erḥāmᵉḵā yhwh ḥizqî*); this is also the only time when Yahweh appears as object of the verb. Neither the graphically and semantically reasonable emendation of the verb to *'ᵃrōmimᵉḵā* after the model of Ps. 30:2(1) (cf. also Ps. 145:1) nor the unlikely interpretation of *rḥm* as meaning "sing," based weakly on a single dubious Ugaritic text,[31] commends itself. The parallel recension in 2 S. 22 does not contain the disputed stich. Ps. 116, which appears to presuppose Ps. 18 (cf. 18:5ff.[4ff.] with 116:3-4), uses *'hb* instead of *rḥm*. Furthermore, only in Imperial Aramaic and Jewish Aramaic does *rḥm* clearly take on a well-attested broader meaning, roughly with the sense of "love." For these reasons it appears best to view *rḥm* in Ps. 18:2(1) as an Aramaism already recognized at the time when Ps. 116 was composed. If we keep in mind the regular use of *rḥm* piel and pual in the sense of "show mercy/compassion," the notion that this broader meaning of *rḥm* was generally familiar to the OT authors seems highly unlikely.

3. *Pual.* The pual of *rḥm* is used twice as a personal name (Hos. 1:6,8).[32] In 2:3,25(1,23), the allusion to these personal names is clear. In the asseveration in 14:4(3) the words *bᵉḵā yᵉruḥam yāṯôm,* "in you the orphan finds mercy," summarizes the idea that no help can be expected either from allies or from the people's own efforts. Prov. 28:13 promises mercy to one who confesses and forsakes transgressions.

III. Nouns.

1. *raḥᵃmîm.* a. *Interior.* In connection with human beings, *raḥᵃmîm* appears three times with the meaning "interior." In Gen. 43:30 and 1 K. 3:26, the syntagm *nikmᵉrû raḥᵃmāyw/raḥᵃmêḵā 'el/'al* denotes a state that is both physiological and emotional: Joseph cannot hold back his tears. Prov. 12:10 contrasts the righteous, who know the needs even of their animals, to the hard interior (*raḥᵃmîm,* "feelings") of the wicked: here *raḥᵃmîm* denotes the human personality as a whole. This meaning of *raḥᵃmîm* can also appear in connection with Yahweh (Isa. 63:15). The presence of physiological overtones when *raḥᵃmîm* is used in vv. 7 and 15 is suggested further by the words "they are . . . my sons" (v. 8), "you are our father" (v. 16).

---

31. S. Rin, *BZ* 7 (1963) 22-23.
32. See II.1.e above.

In addition, this physiological and emotional connotation is suggested in Ps. 77:10(9) by the par. *ḥannôṯ* and confirmed by the verb *qpṣ* ("shut up" — a sign of hard-heartedness [cf. Dt. 15:7]).

b. *With ntn.* We find *raḥ*ᵃ*mîm* used seven times as an element of the syntagm *ntn* suffix object/*l*ᵉ + suffix/*'eṯ* + suffix *(l*ᵉ*)raḥ*ᵃ*mîm lip̱nê* X. The subject of *ntn* is always *yhwh/*ᵉ*lōhîm/'ēl šadday.* Those who receive *raḥ*ᵃ*mîm* may be the Israelites in general (Dt. 13:18[17]; 1 K. 8:50; Jer. 42:12; Ps. 106:46) or particular individuals (Joseph's brothers, Gen. 43:14; Nehemiah, Neh. 1:11; Daniel, Dnl. 1:9). An enemy (captors, 1 K. 8:50; Ps. 106:46) or a person in authority (Joseph, Gen. 43:14; the king, Neh. 1:11; the palace master, Dnl. 1:9) must show *raḥ*ᵃ*mîm.* In Jer. 42:12 it is the king of Babylon (cf. v. 11), in Dt. 13:18(17) Yahweh himself, although he is not named. The syntagm *ntn (l*ᵉ*)raḥ*ᵃ*mîm* may be the object of a wish expressed by Jacob (Genesis) or Moses (Deuteronomy), a prayer uttered by Nehemiah (Nehemiah), an assured prediction made by Solomon or Yahweh himself (Jeremiah), or a statement spoken by the narrator (Dnl. 1:9) or the psalmist (Ps. 106:46).

The texts present *raḥ*ᵃ*mîm* as a concrete benefit: for Jacob and his sons, it is the return of Benjamin; for Nehemiah, permission to return to Jerusalem and rebuild the walls of the city (Neh. 5–6); for Daniel, permission to refuse unclean food; for the people, mercy on the part of their captors (1 K. 8:50), consent to return to their homeland (Jer. 42:12), and an increase in population (Dt. 13:18[17]).

Ps. 106 does not state explicitly the substance of God's *raḥ*ᵃ*mîm.* The structural unity of this psalm is organized around the tension between Yahweh, who delivers (*yš'*, vv. 4,8,10,21; *nṣl,* v. 43), and the people, who are incapable of remembering Yahweh's wonderful acts (vv. 7,13,21). The psalm is framed by the petition in v. 4 and the asseveration in vv. 45-46, which bring together remembrance (on the part of God) and deliverance on the one hand, and remembrance and compassion on the other. By remembering the covenant, Yahweh vouchsafes the people his steadfast love and compassion (v. 45) and causes their enemies to pity them (v. 46). The lack of specificity in the meaning of *raḥ*ᵃ*mîm* in the psalm makes its function as an essential element in Yahweh's mighty acts all the clearer.

Human *raḥ*ᵃ*mîm* participates in the *raḥ*ᵃ*mîm* of Yahweh; it must therefore be requested as a gift of God. This is clear in the long motivation section introducing the prayer of Nehemiah (Neh. 1), which comprises the following elements: allusion to the formula of Dt. 7:9 (v. 5),[33] emphasis on the constant nature of the prayer itself (v. 6), humble confession of sins (v. 7), and remembrance of the promises made to Moses (vv. 8-10). Dnl. 1:9 also states explicitly that only God grants *raḥ*ᵃ*mîm* (and *ḥeseḏ*). Both gifts belong to the realm of the Deity: a human being can only mediate them.

In Isa. 47:6 (*lō' śamt lāhem raḥ*ᵃ*mîm,* "you showed them no mercy," an indictment of Babylon), *śym raḥ*ᵃ*mîm* has been substituted for *ntn raḥ*ᵃ*mîm* under the influence of Akk. *šakān rēmi.*[34]

33. See III.2 below.
34. Y. Avishur, *Shnaton* 5 (1978) 91-99.

c. *raḥamîm in parallel with ḥeseḏ.* We find *raḥ^{a}mîm* together with *ḥeseḏ* without the mark of the accusative as the object of *'āśâ* (Zec. 7:9) and *'tr* hiphil (Ps. 103:4), with the mark of the accusative as the object of *'sp* (Jer. 16:5), with the second personal singular pronominal suffix as the object of *zkr* (Ps. 25:6), with the prep. *b^e* as the object of *'rś* (Hos. 2:21[19]), with the prep. *l^e* as the indirect object of *ntn* (Dnl. 1:9),[35] and with the comparative particle *k^e* as the circumstantial object of *gml* (Isa. 63:7).

The nouns *raḥ^{a}mîm* and *ḥeseḏ* also appear in parallel in chiastic constructions:

Ps. 40:12(11): *kl' raḥ^{a}mêḵā* par. *ḥeseḏ we'^{e}meṯ nṣr;*
Ps. 51:3(2): *ḥnn k^{e}ḥasdeḵā* par. *k^{e}rōḇ raḥ^{a}mêḵā mḥh;*
Ps. 69:17(16): *ṭôḇ ḥasdeḵā* par. *k^{e}rōḇ raḥ^{a}meyḵā pnh;*
Ps. 106:45-46: *nḥm k^{e}rōḇ ḥ^{a}sāḏāw* par. *ntn l^{e}raḥ^{a}mîm;*
Lam. 3:22: *ḥeseḏ yhwh tmm* par. *klh raḥ^{a}mîm.*

(1) Ps. 25, an individual lament, prays for God's help against the psalmist's enemies (vv. 2,19). The hope behind this plea is that Yahweh will be mindful of his *ḥeseḏ* and *raḥ^{a}mîm* rather than the sins of the petitioner, and lead the psalmist on his paths of *ḥeseḏ* and *'^{e}meṯ* (vv. 4-5,8-10,12).

In Ps. 40:2-11(1-10) the psalmist proclaims the wonders, righteousness, faithfulness, and truth of God's works (vv. 6,10[5,9]). The petition that follows in v. 12(11), "Do not withhold your mercy *(raḥ^{a}mêḵā)* from me," which repeats the words *ḥeseḏ* and *'^{e}meṯ* from v. 11b, has its meaning developed in vv. 13-18(12-17), after the model of Ps. 70. Afflicted for the present (vv. 14-16[13-15]), the psalmist declares that his apparent life of obscure suffering is not the last word. His enemies will be punished (vv. 15-16[14-15]), and those who seek Yahweh will rejoice in him. The reason for the psalmist's doubts are his manifold sins (v. 13[12]). The psalm thus presents personal and social evil as an incalculable reality, for which only God's *raḥ^{a}mîm* provides an answer.

In Ps. 51, too, the psalmist prays to be delivered from sin (v. 7[5]) through Yahweh's *ḥeseḏ* and *raḥ^{a}mîm.* How Yahweh will bring this to pass is stated in v. 8(6).

Although the author of Ps. 69 acknowledges his folly *('iwweleṯ)* and hence his vulnerability to sin, the "disgrace, dishonor, slander" (vv. 6,8,10-11,20-21[5,7,9-10,19-20]) are due to his enemies. In this situation the psalmist's prayer (vv. 14-19,30[13-18,29]) appeals to Yahweh's *raḥ^{a}mîm* (v. 17[16]).

Ps. 103 is a hymn of praise to divine mercy. Yahweh does more than respond to sins and human transgressions with forgiveness (v. 3). He does not treat reconciliation as the consequence of good works, but anticipates human need with *ḥeseḏ* and *raḥ^{a}mîm* (v. 4), because he knows the weakness of human nature (vv. 14ff.). So as not to deal with human beings according to their sins (v. 10), Yahweh sets a distance between the sin and the sinner (v. 12); for he is "merciful and gracious, slow to anger and abounding in steadfast love" (v. 8).[36] The piel of *rḥm* also appears twice in v. 13. Yahweh's

35. See III.1.b above.
36. See III.2 below.

saving acts are characterized by *ṣeḏeq* (vv. 6,17). Nevertheless, vv. 17-18 appear to lay down a condition: those who would receive God's steadfast love must fear and honor Yahweh, keep his covenant, and carry out the commandments.

(2) Lam. 3:1-18, an individual lament, voices the agony of the speaker, praying that Yahweh will remember *(zkr)* his affliction and restlessness (v. 19). Because the steadfast love of Yahweh never ceases, his mercies never come to an end, and his faithfulness is great (vv. 22-23), the speaker can continue to wait for help from the Lord (v. 26). The sapiential exhortation in vv. 25-30 describing the conduct of whoever hopes in God ends with a repeated emphasis on God's compassion and steadfast love (v. 32). Thus *rḥm* and *ḥeseḏ* are the ultimate foundation for the continued hope of the speaker and the community (vv. 40-47) in the face of their affliction.

Isa. 63:7 summarizes the first section (vv. 7-14) of the large unit 63:7–64:11, composed in the style of sapiential psalms. V. 7 is a declaration of praise for Yahweh for the favor he has shown according to his *raḥᵃmîm* and *ḥᵃsāḏîm:* leading his people (vv. 9,12,13,14). The psalmist's remembrance of Yahweh's deeds permits him to voice his prayer (vv. 15-17). Through mention of Yahweh's *raḥᵃmîm* (v. 15), the psalmist seeks to hasten Yahweh's intervention against the enemy, by calling to remembrance his merciful compassion, which allows Yahweh to forget the faithlessness of his people and continue to stand beside them.

The combination of *ḥeseḏ* and *raḥᵃmîm* with *ṣeḏeq, mišpāṭ,* and *'ᵉmûnâ* is the bride-price Yahweh is prepared to pay for marrying Israel (Hos. 2:21[19]).[37] Since *ḥeseḏ* and *raḥᵃmîm* are within Yahweh's sovereign power, he can also take them away (Jer. 16:5) if the people continue stubbornly in the sins of their ancestors. Then not even lamentation for the dead will be able to comfort the survivors.

We also find *raḥᵃmîm* in the context of human relations. The exhortation in Zec. 7:8ff. is addressed to the *'am hā'āreṣ.*[38] The ethical ideal of the prophet is expressed in two double clauses, each of which comprises a concrete norm (v. 9, rendering true judgments; v. 10, not oppressing the poor) and a general principle (v. 9, showing *ḥeseḏ* and *raḥᵃmîm* toward one's neighbor; v. 10, not devising evil against one another). "Showing kindness and mercy" stands in contrast to having a stiff neck and a hard heart (vv. 11-12) and demands that Yahweh treat the guilty (v. 13) as they treat their neighbors. Only in this text do we find *raḥᵃmîm* and *ḥeseḏ* as objects of exhortation reduced to an ethical category.

d. *raḥᵃmîm rabbîm.* We often find *rabbîm* qualifying *raḥᵃmîm,* either attributively in a nominal clause (2 S. 24:14 par. 1 Ch. 21:13; Ps. 119:156) or as an adjective (Neh. 9:19,27,28,31; Dnl. 9:18). In 2 Samuel 24 David "founders" before Yahweh by choosing punishment for the people rather than for himself (vv. 13-14). His pretext — that the mercy of Yahweh is very great — will nevertheless prove true, at least according to the interpretation of v. 16: Yahweh does not carry out the threatened punishment. According to v. 17, David confesses his own personal responsibility. The story finally

---

37. W. Vogels, *Bibl* 69 (1988) 412-21.
38. K. Elliger, *Sacharja. ATD* XXV (1985), 135ff.

paints a picture of a king who has learned what mercy is and is therefore qualified to institute a liturgy of reconciliation (vv. 18-25).[39]

In Neh. 9:6-37 the phrase *bᵉ/kᵉ raḥᵃmêḵā harabbîm/rabbôṯ* (vv. 19,27,31; cf. also *kᵉraḥᵃmêḵā* in v. 28) divides Ezra's penitential prayer into four sections, the first three of which exhibit a similar structure: description of Yahweh's acts on Israel's behalf, confession of the people's sins, assurance that Yahweh, who has delivered and saved the people "in his great mercy," will remain faithful. Yahweh's mercy is further underlined by the formula *ḥannûn wᵉraḥûm.*[40]

The prayer of Daniel (Dnl. 9:4-19) for Jerusalem and above all for the sanctuary is structured on the repeated contrast between the righteousness of God and the sinfulness of the people. This polarity can be transcended only by Yahweh's mercy (vv. 9,18).

e. *Other.* In Zec. 1:16 *raḥᵃmîm* is the attribute of Yahweh that accounts for the charge to rebuild the temple. The author of Ps. 79 prays for Yahweh to intervene against the enemy for two reasons: the political and religious transgressions of the nations (vv. 1-4) must be punished (vv. 6,7,10,12), and Yahweh's name must be glorified (v. 9). The psalmist's petition on behalf of Israel is focused in vv. 8-9: "Come speedily to grant us your compassion"; from this compassion flow deliverance and forgiveness (v. 9). Ps. 145:9 calls to mind that "Yahweh's compassion is over all that he has made."

In Amos's indictment of Edom (Am. 1:11), *raḥᵃmîm* may have a more concrete sense than "compassion" or "mercy." Etymological evidence stands in the way of accepting Fishbane's proposal to translate *raḥᵃmîm* as "friends, allies."[41] Without etymological support, the argument based on the structure of Am. 1:11 is insufficient.[42] It does seem likely that in some texts *rḥm* contains an allusion to the covenant,[43] but in my opinion the translation "covenant mercy" in Am. 1:11 is not persuasive.

2. *raḥûm.* The adjectival form *raḥûm* occurs 13 times in the Hebrew Bible, 11 times in combination with *ḥannûn.* One of the foundation stones of the Yahweh creed is the formula *yhwh/'ēl raḥûm wᵉḥannûn* (or *ḥannûn wᵉraḥûm*[44]) together with *'ereḵ 'appayim wᵉraḇ ḥeseḏ* (Ps. 103:8; 145:8; Joel 2:13; Jon. 4:2; Neh. 9:17) and *we'ᵉmeṯ* (Ex. 34:6; Ps. 86:15). In Neh. 9:31; 2 Ch. 30:9; Ps. 111:4; 112:4 we find *ḥannûn wᵉraḥûm* by itself, without the other elements of the formula; in Dt. 4:31 and Ps. 78:38 we find only *raḥûm.*

Ps. 112:4 is the only text that uses the formula to describe human beings (and not Yahweh). In Ex. 34:6 the formula appears alongside other standard phrases (v. 7; cf. Nu. 14:18 and Ex. 20:5b par. Dt. 5:9-10; Dt. 7:9-10).

---

39. Schenker, 28.

40. See III.2 below.

41. M. Fishbane, *JBL* 89 (1970) 313-18; 91 (1972) 391-93; see I.1 above and R. B. Coote, *JBL* 90 (1971) 206-8.

42. Cf. M. L. Barré, *CBQ* 47 (1985) 420-27.

43. Coote, *JBL* 90 (1971) 206-8; J. Wijngaards, *VT* 17 (1967) 232-33.

44. → V, 25.

This creed (which Spieckermann calls the "compassion formula") probably emerged relatively late as a prayer formula in the context of the cultic traditions. Its lateness is suggested by the observation that it appears in Yahweh's proclamation of himself to Moses in Ex. 34:6 and otherwise (except for Joel 2:13) only in prayers that can be assigned a late date. Joel, Jonah, Nehemiah, and 2 Chronicles are clearly postexilic; Ps. 78, 86, 103, 111, 112, and 145 belong to the latest stratum of the Psalter, as their numerous borrowings from earlier psalms show; Dt. 4:31 is one of the late accretions to Deuteronomy.[45] Ex. 34:6, possibly the earliest occurrence, can hardly belong to the core of J; most likely it should be considered part of the surrounding frame (vv. 1-9 and 28), belonging to a late Dtr postexilic recension.[46] It is no longer possible to decide whether the "long formula"[47] (vv. 6-7) or the short formula (v. 6) is the original form. Neither is it possible to determine whether one should posit a conflict between the Dtr doctrine of retribution (Dt. 5:9-10 par. Ex. 20:5-6) and the compassion formula, conflict that would have suppressed the compassion formula for some time.[48]

The compassion formula in Ex. 34:6 is accompanied in v. 7 by the elucidation that Yahweh keeps steadfast love "for thousands." His righteousness consists in forgiving sin and wickedness, but not letting them go unpunished. This apparent contradiction can be understood only if punishment and forgiveness are understood as separate stages. If punishment aims to restore an objective order that has been infringed, it should be treated as reparation in the metaphysical sense. Forgiveness, by contrast, is the restoration of a personal relationship between the offended and the offender on the free initiative of the former. Seen in this context, the compassion formula in Ex. 34:6 refers to God's ability to forgive, which is not contrary to the objective necessity of punishment.

Earlier Dtr formularies carry a rather different accent. Dt. 7:9-10 begins by asserting God's faithfulness. He maintains covenant loyalty, however, only with those who love him and keep his commandments, but requites *(šlm)* those who "hate him." Dt. 5:9-10 (par. Ex. 20:5-6) describes Yahweh as a jealous God, punishing children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren for the iniquity of their parents — but only among those who hate him. The positive portion of this formulary is fundamentally identical with that of Dt. 7:9. Both texts speak of a mutual and compensated relationship, but not pure forgiveness, as the restoration of personal relationships.

The Deuteronomist of Dt. 4 also maintains the tension between a merciful and a jealous God. Steadfast love characterizes the former, punishment the latter. The structure of Dt. 4:23-31 shows that the framing verses 24 *('ēl qannā')* and 31 *('ēl raḥûm)* summarize the list of opposites: loss and occupation of the land, extermination and posterity, faithlessness and fidelity, subjection to idols and freedom before Yahweh, faithlessness on the part of the people and Yahweh's fidelity, punishment and reward,

45. Knapp, *Deuteronomium 4,* 96-97.

46. L. Perlitt, *Bundestheologie im AT. WMANT* 36 (1969), 203-32; E. Aurelius, *Das Fürbitter Israels. CBOT* 27 (1988), 117; Schmidt, 90.

47. Dentan, 35-36.

48. Spieckermann.

impotence of the gods and Yahweh's salvific will, wrath and mercy.[49] The title *'ēl raḥûm* reinforces the possibility of Israel's final repentance, return, and restoration after apostasy and exile. It is therefore not self-evident that Ex. 20:5b,6 and the Deuteronomy texts presuppose the formulary of Ex. 34:6-7[50] or that they were intended to replace the latter. The compassion formula appears instead to introduce a new conception, which led to the modification of the requital principle. Its prehistory before it became textually fixed in Ex. 34:6 can no longer be traced.

If, with most interpreters, we assume that the intercession scene in Nu. 14:11-25 is a Dtr interpolation, later than and dependent on Ex. 34,[51] the partial quotation in Nu. 14:18, without *raḥûm wᵉḥannûn,* would indicate that these epithets were incorporated into Ex. 34:6-7 after the quotation from Nu. 14:18.

Ex. 34:6-7 achieves a balance between mercy and justice; this balance tilts in favor of clemency, however, in the other postexilic texts that cite the compassion formula. The notion of punishment for sin is suppressed (cf. Ps. 103:8) and the assertion of God's compassion is stressed.[52] Possibly the return in Ex. 34:10,12 to the vocabulary of sin in v. 7 may be understood as representing a conflict with the doctrine of retribution.[53]

The history of Israel (Ps. 78) is marked by divine wonders and the faithlessness of the people (vv. 8,22,32,37). At the center of this history, however, stands the compassion (*raḥûm,* v. 38) of Yahweh, who repeatedly forgives and accepts human beings in all their weakness (v. 39).

The prayer of Ezra in Neh. 9 interprets the history of Israel similarly: the sequence of God's beneficence, the people's obstinance, and God's forgiveness can be comprehended only from the perspective of Yahweh's own nature. V. 17 cites the compassion formula in its entirety, introduced by the words "a God ready to forgive" (cf. vv. 19,31). Hezekiah uses the same argument ("Yahweh your God is *ḥannûn wᵉraḥûm,*" 2 Ch. 30:9) in his exhortation to the people to return to God.

In both the call to repentance in Joel 2:12-17 (v. 13) and the prayer of Jonah (Jon. 4:2), the compassion formula is followed by the expression *wᵉniḥām 'al-hārā'â.*[54] Hitherto the doctrine of God's mercy and compassion has been an internal concern of the people of Israel; for Jonah, however, it is "how Yahweh treats all human beings," without regard to nationality or religion.[55] Along the same lines, the late postexilic acrostic Ps. 145 cites the compassion formula (v. 8) and then interprets it: "Yahweh is good to all, and his compassion is over all that he has made" (v. 9).[56]

The role of the compassion formula in Ps. 86:15; 111:4; 112:4 is not clearly defined.

---

49. G. Braulik, *Der Mittel deuteronomischer Rhetorik. AnBibl* 68 (1978), 59-60.
50. Levin, 171.
51. Aurelius 130,132.
52. See III.1.c and II.1.b above.
53. Spieckermann.
54. → IX, 345-47.
55. Schmidt, 125. See also Spieckermann.
56. See III.1.e above.

3. *raḥ^a mānî.* The adj. *raḥ^a mānî* occurs only once (Lam. 4:10), in the feminine plural. It stresses the horror of the situation: even the *nāšîm raḥ^a mānîyôṯ* (compassionate, loving women) are forced to cook and eat their own children.

IV. Summary. Our analytic presentation of how the verbal and nominal forms of *rḥm* are used has brought to light a variety of semantic, linguistic, and theological aspects. The root occurs frequently in clusters, whether in a single verse (Dt. 13:18[17]; 1 K. 8:50; Ps. 103:13; Jer. 42:12; Hos. 2:25[23]) or in larger textual units (Gen. 43:14,30; Ex. 33:19; 34:6; Neh. 9; Isa. 49; 54; 63:7–64:11[12]; Dnl. 9; Hos. 1–2; Ps. 103). In texts where *rḥm* appears only once, its weight is often augmented by emphatic constructions.[57] The occurrence of verbal and nominal forms together is rare (Dt. 13:18[17]; 1 K. 8:50; Isa. 54:7,8,10; Jer. 42:12; Ps. 103) and is not found in pre-Dtr texts. Nominal forms appear primarily in exilic and postexilic texts (possible exceptions: Gen. 43:14,30; Ex. 34:6; Jer. 16:5; Hos. 2:21[19]); verbal forms by themselves appear also in texts that are generally considered pre-Dtr. Hos. 1–2 is the earliest complex in which *rḥm* has theological significance.

Secular usage of *rḥm* — if any — is very limited: only in Prov. 28:13 might *rḥm* pual refer to human mercy. In the other texts where *rḥm* occurs as a verb, it is always associated with Yahweh, whether Yahweh himself shows or withholds mercy or human beings show or withhold mercy as agents of the divine will.

With the possible exception of Ps. 112:4, *raḥûm* is associated exclusively with Yahweh. Except in the passages where *raḥ^a mîm* has physical connotations (Gen. 43:30; 1 K. 3:26), it always denotes the compassion or mercy that Yahweh shows or withholds, directly or through human agents. Thus *rḥm* appears to be indigenous to religious and theological language; only occasionally does it refer to human relationships.

Like *ḥeseḏ, rḥm* is a term associated with actions in the social realm;[58] only rarely is its object a single individual.[59] Exceptions are Daniel, the upright person of Prov. 28:13, and the psalmists, although they embody the community of the faithful. The active nature of the root is best seen in the various combinations in which the verb occurs and in the consequences of *raḥ^a mîm.* Concretely, Yahweh's compassion means "show mercy," "pardon," "forgive," "comfort," "spare," "pity," "strengthen," "save," "turn to," and even more concretely "bring back," "assemble," "rebuild," "elect," "grant rest," or (negatively) "not smite," "not sadden."

But *rḥm* is not totally synonymous with any of these terms. The use of the verb in combination with other verbs shows that it needs to be given concrete meaning. In any case *rḥm* clearly suggests a fundamental attitude that takes effect in various actions. This fundamental attitude presupposes a situation of suffering, affliction, guilt, danger, weakness — but also the possibility of alleviating or even abolishing this situation.

---

57. See II.1.a above.
58. → III, 56.
59. See II.1.a above.

Because the root *rḥm* above all conveys the essence of mercy, it is only logical that an attributive adjective like *raḥûm* should be derived from it, an adjective that, together with *ḥannûn,* developed into a confession of faith in Yahweh.

To say that Yahweh has acted (e.g., Isa. 63:7) or will act (e.g., Isa. 54:7; Hos. 2:21[19]) *kᵉ/bᵉ raḥᵃmîm* means nothing less than to affirm that Yahweh acts consonantly with his essential nature. It is against this background that we should interpret the prayers that Yahweh will blot out transgressions (Ps. 51:3[1]) or turn to the psalmist (69:17[16]) *kᵉrōḇ raḥᵃmîm* (cf. also Neh. 9:19,27,28,31) or simply remember his *raḥᵃmîm* (Ps. 25:6) and not withhold it (Ps. 40:12[11]).

To vouchsafe someone *raḥᵃmîm* or to entrust someone to *raḥᵃmîm* means to entrust them to the compassionate hands of another person, whether the latter is inherently compassionate or acts at Yahweh's behest.

The psalmist's rejoicing at having been crowned with Yahweh's mercy is an affirmation of having been accepted into the innermost core of Yahweh's nature.

Showing mercy is a judicial act on the part of Yahweh, for he rises up (*rwm,* Isa. 30:18; *qwm,* Ps. 102:14[13]) like a judge to declare and execute *rḥm.* Therefore *rḥm* is performed in the conflict between human guilt and divine justice. To show *rḥm* is a decision no longer to judge on the basis of people's guilt, but rather to take into account their inherent structural weakness and inability to recognize their own transgressions and responsibility.

We may say in summary that *rḥm* is a fundamental element of Yahweh's nature. Expressed in earlier texts almost exclusively by the verb *rḥm,* this element is later differentiated and stated more precisely by the standard theological terms *raḥᵃmîm* and *raḥûm.* The combination *ḥeseḏ wᵉraḥᵃmîm* is important in this context. It should not be translated as "merciful kindness" or interpreted as divine "mercy."[60] The parallelism suggests treating it as a compound of complementary expressions: *ḥeseḏ* expresses the fundamental goodness of God, *rḥm* the special favor shown by God in the face of a situation of sin and affliction (cf. Isa. 54:8: "Because of [my] everlasting goodness I have had compassion on you").

The relationship between *raḥûm* and *ḥannûn* can be assessed similarly. If *ḥnn* means benevolence, approval, and friendliness in personal relationships, as well as favor of a particular kind,[61] then it is clear that *raḥûm/riḥam* in combination with *ḥannûn* or *ḥnn* describes God's reaction to sin and affliction.

Simian-Yofre

V. Dead Sea Scrolls. In the Dead Sea Scrolls, in contrast to the OT, there is a clear numerical preponderance of the substantive over the verb: of 60 occurrences of the root, 45 involve the substantive and 10 the verb; the adj. *rḥwm* or *rḥmwm* (4Q381) occurs only 3 times.

60. → V, 53, 55.
61. → V, 23-24.

1. *Verb.* In the prayers of the Qumran community God is often the subject of *rḥm;* in every instance the object is a pronominal suffix. Showing *rḥm* is an essential element of God's nature in relationship with humans. The worshipers declare that God has had compassion on them (*rḥmnw,* 4Q508 frs. 22-23, 1) and that God's compassion has existed since the beginning (*rḥmnw m'wlm,* 4Q509 fr. 17, 2). They pray that God will have compassion on account of their fasting (*'l t'nytm,* 4Q509 fr. 16, 3) and not charge the sins of their ancestors to their account (4QDibHam^{c} frs. 131-32, 11-12).

With other subjects *rḥm* can appear in negative contexts: 1QpHab 6:12 interprets Hab. 1:17 as referring to the Kittim (Romans), who "have no mercy even on the fruit in the womb." In a differentiated code of conduct (1QS 10:17-26), an individual member of the community expresses his intent to have no mercy "on all who depart from the way" (ll. 20-21). CD 13:9 requires the *m^{e}baqqēr* "to have compassion on them [the multitude to whom he gives instruction] as a father has compassion on his sons."

In 1QH 9:35-36 we have a special case: "You are a father to all the sons of your truth and rejoice in them as a mother rejoices in her child." To God, addressed as father, maternal (root *rḥm*) joy is ascribed as an (essential) attribute.[62]

2. *raḥ^{a}mîm.* In most cases God's *raḥ^{a}mîm* refers to God's compassionate treatment of the worshiper, the "sons of his pleasure," or Israel, and the mighty acts in which God has come to their aid against the power of sin (1QS 1:22; 1QH 4:32; 7:27; 9:30-31; 11:9; 1QH fr. 16:3; 2Q22 fr. 2, 2). Its formulaic nature, expressed in a construct phrase with *ḥsd* (1QS 1:22; 2:1; 4Q403 fr. 1, 1:23 par. 4Q405 fr. 3, 2:15) or in parallelism with *ḥsd* (1QS 11:13; 1QH 1:31-32; 4:37; etc.; 11QPs^{a} 19:8) and *slyḥwt* (1QH 7:30,35; 9:34; 10:21; 11:32; 4Q400 fr. 1, 1:18) and its frequent modification by the intensifying adj. *hmwn* (1QH 4:37; 6:9; 7:30,35; etc.) or *rwb* (1QS 4:3; 1QH 4:32; 13:17; 18:14; etc.; 4Q508 frs. 22-23, 2; 11QPs^{a} 19:5,11) suggest that *raḥ^{a}mîm* is usually rather meager in semantic content.[63] This conclusion is reinforced by the frequent absence of verbs in combination with *raḥ^{a}mîm* in 1QH, in contrast to OT usage (but cf. 1QS 1:22, *šm'* hiphil; 2:1, *gml;* 2:7, *'rr;* 11:13, *ngš* hiphil; 1QM 11:3-4, *yš'* hiphil); in addition, the addressee remains unspecified. Thus it is hard to define the concrete nature of these compassionate acts on God's part. What is clear (see esp. 1QH 7:27) is that God's salvific activity is already present here and now in the community.[64]

A benediction formula blesses God as a "God of compassion" (*' hrḥmym,* 1QH 10:14; 11:29). In 1QH 16:9 God's demonstrations of grace and mercy are ascribed to the "spirit of compassion" (*rwḥ rḥmyk;* cf. also 1QH 14:25, *ḥnn* + *rwḥ d'h*).[65]

The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice speak of *rḥmy kbdw* 3 times (4Q403 fr. 1, 1:8 par. 4Q405 fr. 3, 2:8; 4Q405 fr. 13, 2). The *rḥmy 'wlmym* mentioned in 4Q400 fr. 1, 1:8 also appear in 4QBerakot, unpublished at the time of writing.

---

62. See this discussion of Ps. 103:13 and Isa. 49:15 in II.1.b above.

63. J. Becker, *Das Heil Gottes. SUNT* 3 (1964), 160-61.

64. H.-W. Kuhn, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil. SUNT* 4 (1966), 167-69.

65. *Ibid.,* 134, 139.

3. *Adjective.* As in the OT, the adj. *rḥwm* (1QH 16:16) or *rḥmwn* (4Q381 frs. 10-11, 3; 4Q381 fr. 47, 1 [+ *ḥnwn*]) is used to describe God both in apostrophe and attributively. The unique form *rḥmwn* derives from Mishnaic Hebrew.[66]

Dahmen

---

66. E. M. Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran. HSS* 28 (1986), 90; E. Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls. HSS* 29 (1986), 39-40 (no. 200.26).

רֶחֶם *reḥem;* רַחַם *raḥam;* *רַחֲמָה *$*raḥ^{a}m\hat{a}$*

I. Etymology. II. Occurrences, Parallels, Idioms. III. Usage. IV. 1. LXX; 2. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Etymology. The etymological questions surrounding the Biblical Hebrew nouns *reḥem* (25 times in the OT), *raḥam* (4 times), and *$raḥ^{a}m\hat{a}$* (once), "womb,"[1] have been answered only in part.The relationship of these nouns to the verb → רחם *rḥm,* "love, have compassion," remains uncertain. Akk. *rêmu,* "womb, compassion" (the etymological equivalent of *raḥam*), is "the word typically used to express compassion or loving affection 'from above'";[2] but the relationship of *rāḥam* to *ra'āmu/râmu,* "be de-

---

reḥem. J. Behm, "κοιλία," *TDNT,* III, 786-89; R. B. Coote, "Amos 1:11: *RḤMYW,*" *JBL* 90 (1971) 206-8; M. Dahood, "Denominative *riḥḥam* 'to conceive, enwomb,'" *Bibl* 44 (1963) 204-5; R. Gordis, *Studies in the Book of Amos. Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research Jubilee Volume* 1-2 (1980), esp. 1:211; M. I. Gruber, "The Motherhood of God in Second Isaiah," *RB* 90 (1983) 351-59; *idem,* "'Will a Woman Forget Her Infant . . . ?'" *Tarbiz* 51 (1981/82) 491-92; A. Jepsen, "Gnade und Barmherzigkeit im AT," *KuD* 7 (1961) 261-71; F. R. McCurley, "A Semantic Study of Anatomical Terms in Akkadian, Ugaritic, and Biblical Literature" (diss., Dropsie College, 1968); W. Michaelis, "μήτηρ," *TDNT,* IV, 645-47; W. L. Moran, "The Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy," *CBQ* 25 (1963) 77-87; Y. Muffs, "Joy and Love as Metaphorical Expressions of Willingness and Spontaneity in Cuneiform, Ancient Hebrew, and Related Literatures," in J. Neusner, ed., *Christianity, Judaism, and Other Greco-Roman Cults. FS M. Smith,* 3 vols. (Leiden, 1975), 1-36, esp. 5; *idem, Studies in the Aramaic Legal Papyri from Elephantine. Studia et Documenta* 8 (New York, 1969); S. M. Paul, "Amos 1:3–2:3: A Concatenous Literary Pattern," *JBL* 90 (1971) 397-403; F. Rundgren, "Semitische Wortstudien," *OrS* 10 (1961) 99-136, esp. 121-27; G. Schmuttermayr, "*RḤM,* eine lexikalische Studie," *Bibl* 51 (1970) 499-532; A. van Selms, *Marriage and Family Life in Ugaritic Literature. POS* 1 (1954).
→ בטן *beṭen;* → רחם *rḥm.*

1. *BLe,* §61k′.
2. Schmuttermayr, 509.

voted, be faithful, love,"[3] must also be considered. The same is true of the relationship of the verb *rḥm* to Arab. *raḥima,* "show compassion, have mercy," and *raḥuma,* "be soft, show sympathy, love."[4] To all appearances, the tendency of present-day scholarship is to posit a Common Semitic verb *rḥm* with an equally comprehensive semantic domain, similar to that of → אהב *'āhab,* "love."[5] We must also consider the possibility that some OT texts use a verb *rāḥam (riḥam)* denominated from *reḥem* (esp. Isa. 49:15a; Jer. 20:17; Job 3:11; Ps. 110:3b), as Dahood has claimed.[6]

In any case it is clear that the nouns *reḥem/raḥam/*raḥᵃmâ* (cf. esp. Arab. *raḥm/raḥim,* "womb"[7]) are connected etymologically with Ugar. and Moab. *rḥm* and probably also with Phoen. *rḥm,* "womb."[8]

The Ugaritic noun *rḥm* is relatively rare, and its occurrences have often been the subject of differing interpretations. It is clear that sometimes *rḥm* is used as the name or title of a goddess (esp. *'ṯrt wrḥm,*[9] *'ṯrt wrḥmy;*[10] cf. also *rḥmy*[11]). These goddesses live in a more or less unusual marital relationship, with the marriage ceremony denoted by *mhr* or *trḫ.*[12] In one text concerning ʿAnat, however, *rḥm* should not be interpreted as a title but as a term for "(slave) girl, virgin,"[13] a meaning close to that of ancient Hebrew hapax legomenon **raḥᵃmâ* in Jgs. 5:30, used in the expression *raḥam raḥᵃmāṯayim,* "one, two wombs," clearly a soldiers' term for concubines captured in war, as well as Moab. *rḥm,* "female slave," in the Mesha Inscription.[14] The textual evidence is too scanty, however, to justify the thesis of van Selms that Heb. and Moab. *rḥm* represent a semantic shift with respect to Ugar. *rḥm:* "From a word for a woman living in an unusual and more or less obsolete form of marriage, it degenerated into a term for a woman who had sexual relations without living in any form of marriage, and who had probably lost her free status."[15]

Normally, Biblical Heb. *reḥem/raḥam* denotes the female genitalia as a whole (uterus, vulva, and vagina), above all as the site where human life originates. In this function the noun survives not only in Post-Biblical Hebrew but also in Rabbinic Aramaic *raḥᵃmā'/raḥmā'* and Syr. *rᵉḥēm/raḥmā'.*[16]

---

3. *AHw,* II, 951-52, 970-71.
4. Lane, I/3, 1055ff., 1059-60.
5. See, e.g., *APNM,* 261; Schmuttermayr, 523.
6. Dahood, 240-41; see also Jepsen, 261-65; McCurley, 87 n. 287; Muffs, *Studies,* 132-35; *idem,* "Joy and Love" (New York, 1992), III, 5-6 n. 13; Coote, 1206ff.; Paul, 402; Gruber, "Motherhood," 352-53.
7. Lane, I/3, 1055-56.
8. *KAI,* 27.23; cf. Y. Avishur, *UF* 8 (1976) 14.
9. *KTU,* 1.23, 13.
10. *KTU,* 1.23, 28.
11. *KTU,* 1.23, 16; 1.15, II, 6; cf. *UT,* no. 2321; *WUS,* no. 2503.
12. Van Selms, 110-11; → VIII, 146-47.
13. *KTU,* 1.6, II, 27. See *UT,* no. 2321; *WUS,* no. 2502; T. H. Gaster, *Thespis* (New York, 1966), 200.
14. *KAI,* 181.17; cf. also the cj. *rḥm,* "mercy," in *KAI,* 200.13.
15. Van Selms, 110-11.
16. E. Ben-Yehuda, *Thesaurus totius hebraitatis,* 17 vols. (Berlin, 1908-59), 6536-44;

II. Occurrences, Parallels, Idioms. The 25 occurrences of the OT noun *reḥem* are distributed as follows: 5 in Job, 4 each in Exodus and Numbers, 3 each in Genesis, Jeremiah, and Psalms, 2 in 1 Samuel, and once in Hosea. The synonymous *raḥam* occurs 4 times (Gen. 49:25; Isa. 46:3; Ezk. 20:26; Prov. 30:16). The variant feminine form **raḥᵃmâ* occurs once (Jgs. 5:30).

A series of OT texts (e.g., Isa. 46:3; Jer. 1:5; Ps. 22:11[Eng. 10]; 58:4[3]; Job 3:11; 31:15) use the noun in parallel with → בטן *beṭen,* "belly, womb."[17] It is also functionally related at least in part to → חיק *ḥêq,* "(woman's) lap, bosom" (e.g., Dt. 28:56; Prov. 5:20; Ruth 4:16; Lam. 2:12) and **mēʿâ,* "viscera" (in the sense of "womb") (e.g., Gen. 15:4; 25:23; Nu. 5:22; 2 S. 7:12).[18]

There are several additional terms for "womb" in Post-Biblical Hebrew, such as *ḥālāl* (OT "pierced"; but also "deflowered") and *mᵉʿārâ* I (OT "cave"), as well as **pōṯ,* "vulva" (OT probably "forehead");[19] that they had the same function in the OT cannot be demonstrated with certainty.

Among the idioms associated with *reḥem/raḥam,* we single out *peṭer reḥem,* "whatever is first to open the womb" (Ex. 13:2,12,15; 34:19; Nu. 3:12; 18:15; Ezk. 20:26 [*raḥam*]; cf. *piṭraṯ kol-reḥem,* "every [single] thing that opens the womb," Nu. 8:16[20]). We note also such idioms as *pātaḥ ʾeṯ-reḥem,* "open the womb" (Gen. 29:31; 30:22; cf. Phoen. *lypth* [*rḥ*]*my wtld*[21]) and the antonymic *sāgar (bᵉʿaḏ) reḥem,* "close the womb" (1 S. 1:5-6). We also find expressions like *yāṣāʾ mēreḥem,* "come forth from the womb" (Nu. 12:12; Jer. 20:18; Job 38:8), *hôṣîʾ mēreḥem,* "bring forth from the womb" (Job 10:18), *ʿṣar bᵉʿaḏ reḥem,* "close the womb" (Gen. 20:18; cf. Gen. 16:2; Isa. 66:9), and the related *ʿōṣer rāḥam,* "closure of the womb, barrenness" (Prov. 30:16).[22]

III. Usage. Unlike such words as *beṭen,* "belly," *ḥêq,* "lap, bosom," and *mēʿîm,* "viscera," which in the OT can denote parts of the male body, without exception the noun *reḥem/raḥam* is used as a term denoting the female womb.[23]

Together with *šāḏayim,* "breasts," *reḥem/raḥam* thus serves as a general term to denote the female sexual organs, as in the Blessing of Jacob: *birkōṯ šāḏayim wārāḥam,* "blessings of the breasts and of the womb" (Gen. 49:25; cf. Hos. 9:14). In most OT texts, the noun refers to the womb (uterus/vulva), where a child develops between conception and birth; but it actually denotes the female genitalia as a whole. This explains how the noun (fem. **raḥᵃmâ*) can even serve as a general term for a woman, as in the

---

Jastrow, 1467-68; R. Payne Smith, *Thesaurus Syriacus,* 2 vols. (Oxford, 1901), 2:3879-86; Brockelmann, *LexSyr,* 723ff.

17. *HAL,* I, 121.

18. See *HAL,* I, 312; → מעים *mēʿîm;* see also *HAL,* II, 609-10; Rundgren, 121-27.

19. See, respectively, *HAL,* I, 319; II, 615; III, 983.

20. On the hapax legomenon **piṭrâ* see W. Zimmerli in *Near Eastern Studies in Honor of W. F. Albright* (Baltimore, 1971), 460-62 = *Studien zur alttestamentlichen Theologie und Prophetie. ThB* 51 (1974), 236-38; *HAL,* III, 925; → בכר *bᵉkōr.*

21. *KAI,* 27.23.

22. *HAL,* II, 871.

23. Its metaphorical usage in Job 38:8 is discussed below.

ancient Song of Deborah: "Are they not finding and dividing the spoil? — A girl or two for every man" (*h*ª*lō' yimṣ*ᵉ*'û y*ᵉ*ḥall*ᵉ*qû šālāl raḥam raḥ*ª*māṯayim l*ᵉ*rō'š geḇer,* Jgs. 5:30). Naturally it can also refer to a mother: if a "womb" forgets someone, it means the mother herself forgets (Job 24:20; cf. Isa. 49:15).[24]

The OT views human life "from the womb" (*mēreḥem,* Nu. 12:12; Jer. 1:5; 20:17-18; Ps. 22:11[10]; 58:4[3]; 110:3; Job 3:11; 10:18; 38:8; *minnî-rāḥam,* Isa. 46:3). All are fashioned "in the womb" (*bāreḥem,* Job 31:15); but one may die already "from the womb" (*mûṯ mēreḥem,* Job 3:11; Jer. 20:17; cf. Nu. 12:12; Job 10:18) so that the mother becomes a grave (*qeḇer,* Jer. 20:17), while another truly "comes forth from the womb" alive (*yāṣā' mēreḥem,* Nu. 12:12; Jer. 20:18; Job 38:8; hiphil, Job 10:18).

It is theologically significant, however, that only Yahweh, the creator, has from the beginning made and formed woman with a womb, which only he is able to open or to shut, just as he continually opens or shuts the heavenly portals of life-giving precipitation and the fertile womb of mother earth. It is therefore no accident when a woman is "barren":[25] it is Yahweh who "closes" her womb (→ סגר *sāḡar,* 1 S. 1:5-6 [Hannah]; → עצר *'āṣar,* Gen. 20:18; cf. Prov. 30:16; Gen. 16:2; Isa. 66:9; Sir. 42:10; cf. also *reḥem maškîl,* a "barren/miscarrying womb," Hos. 9:14). Similarly only God can "open"[26] the womb, especially in the case of a firstborn (Gen. 29:31, Leah; 30:22, Rachel). In any case Yahweh remains the divine Creator, as in Job's appeal: "Did not he who made me in the womb also make them [Job's servants], did not one fashion us in the womb? (*h*ª*lō'-ḇabbeṭen 'ōśēnî 'āśāhû way*ᵉ*ḵunennû* [for *waykôn*ᵉ*nēnû*] *bāreḥem 'eḥāḏ,* Job 31:15; cf. Jer. 1:5; Eccl. 11:5; 2 Mc. 7:22-23). God alone brings forth human beings from the womb (Job 10:18).

Therefore both the God-fearing psalmist (Ps. 22:11[10]) and the people of Israel (Isa. 46:3) acknowledge their existential dependence on Yahweh from the womb. Conversely, the afflicted and oppressed wish that they had never come forth from their mother's womb (Jer. 20:17-18; Job 3:11; 10:18).

For this reason God's call may come or there may be a special gift of the spirit when one is still in the womb — or even before, as in the account of Jeremiah's call: "Before I formed you in the womb *(beṭen)* I knew you, and before you came forth from the womb *(ûḇ*ᵉ*ṭerem tēṣē' mēreḥem)* I consecrated you; I appointed you a prophet to the nations" (Jer. 1:5; cf. Isa. 49:1: *beṭen/*mē'â*). Similar language is used of the Nazirites (Jgs. 13:5, *beṭen*).[27] On the other hand, the wicked too are perverse and errant from the womb (Ps. 58:4[3]).

Naturally we find *reḥem/raḥam* in OT texts concerning the firstborn.[28] The ancient Israelite notion of the firstborn involves both a sociolegal aspect, focusing primarily on questions of inheritance and therefore patrilineal descent, and a cultic aspect, concerned with matrilineal descent.[29] The OT texts that use *reḥem* in the context of the firstborn thus

---

24. Gruber, "Motherhood," 355-56.
25. → עקר *'āqar.*
26. → פתח *pāṯaḥ.*
27. W. Zimmerli, *OT Theology in Outline* (Eng. trans. Atlanta, 1978), 83-86, 99-107.
28. → בכר *b*ᵉ*ḵōr.*
29. *EncJud,* VI, 1306-12.

fall primarily in the cultic domain. It is true generally that every male opening the womb *(peṭer reḥem)* — both human beings and animals — belongs to Yahweh (Ex. 13:2,12,15; 34:19; Nu. 3:12; 8:16 [*piṭraṯ reḥem*]; 18:15), like the firstfruits. These requirements in part reflect an earlier age when the firstborn son could actually be sacrificed (cf. 2 K. 3:27; also Ezk. 20:26; Mic. 6:7). This practice survives in dramatic form in the plague narratives (e.g., Ex. 11:5; 12:12) and is mentioned etiologically in connection with the Levites (Nu. 3:13). The consecrated firstborn, the Nazirites,[30] had cultic obligations as temple slaves. The regulations governing the Levites are presumably based on traditions of this sort (Nu. 3:12; 8:16). The later regulations governing the redemption[31] of a first-born son (Ex. 13:15; 34:19-20) also appear to have emerged from the cultic domain.

Finally, we note that *reḥem* is occasionally used metaphorically in the OT, in such expressions as "the womb of the sea" (Job 10:18) and possibly also "the womb of the dawn" (Ps. 110:3).[32]

IV. 1. *LXX.* The LXX usually employs *mḗtra,* "vulva, uterus," to translate the nouns *reḥem/raḥam/*raḥ^{a}mâ* (e.g., Gen. 20:18; 29:31; 30:22; 49:25). The expression *kol-peṭer reḥem/raḥam,* "everything that opens the womb," is translated as *pán dianoígon mḗtran* (e.g., Ex. 13:12,15; 34:19; Nu. 18:15; Ezk. 20:26; cf. also Ex. 13:2; Nu. 3:12; 8:16). We also find other translations such as *koilía,* "belly, womb."

2. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* The noun *reḥem* appears only 4 times in the Dead Sea Scrolls; all its occurrences are in 1QH, in a variety of contexts.

The "Hymn of the Teacher" in 1QH 4:5–5:4 (which resembles 1QH 1 in form and structure) includes in 4:29-33[33] (cf. 1:21-27) a confession of God's salvific work preceded by a humility doxology, both of which exhibit the formulaic structure characteristic of the "community hymns." Lines 29-30 describe the lowliness and sinfulness "from the womb" *(mrḥm)* of the human creature of clay, without justice and the perfect path, in contrast to the wonderful works and salvation of God (ll. 27-29,31-32), who alone is just and makes perfect the human path through the spirit (here understood as a soteriological and ethical force[34]).

In 9:30 *reḥem* is the second in a series of at least five elements (ll. 29-31) describing the elective and salvific work of God from impregnation (here *'āḇ,* "father"!) through conception *(reḥem),* pregnancy (*beṭen;*[35] cf. the parallelism of *beṭen* and *reḥem* in God's call of Jeremiah [Jer. 1:5]), and infancy *(šdy hwryty),* to the lap of the wet nurse *(ḥyq 'wmnty)* and beyond (ll. 32-33).

---

30. → נזיר *nāzîr.*

31. → פדה *pāḏâ.*

32. → שחר *šaḥar.*

33. On the "secondary" nature of these lines in comparison with 4:5-29, see J. Becker, *Der Heil Gottes. SUNT* 3 (1964), 54-55; H.-W. Kuhn, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil. SUNT* 4 (1966), 23 n. 3.

34. P. von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial. SUNT* 6 (1969), 133.

35. → בטן *beṭen* II.2.

The soteriological confession in 1QH 15:12ff. contains parallel statements concerning the fate of the righteous and the wicked decreed by God "from the womb," long before or in the act of creation (ll. 15,17), so that their fates are predestined. The "period of approval" *(mw'd rṣwn)* decreed for the righteous "from the womb" begins with or is embodied in life within God's covenant, obeying the commandments and experiencing salvation in the present, as a member of the community. This period, though eschatological, belongs to the present, not the future. By contrast, the punishment of the wicked on the "day of slaughter" *(ywm hrgh),* likewise decreed already "from the womb" (and further substantiated by their wicked conduct), is awaited in the future.[36]

Kronholm

---

36. Kuhn, *Enderwartung,* 38-39, 104-11; H. Lichtenberger, *Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Qumrangemeinde. SUNT* 15 (1980), 70-71, 224-25.

רָחַץ *rāḥaṣ*

I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences and Meaning; 3. LXX. II. Washing and Bathing: 1. Practice; 2. Washing; 3. Bathing; 4. Purpose; 5. Figurative Usage. III. Cultic Ablutions: 1. Language; 2. Obligatory Ablutions; 3. Priestly Ablutions. IV. Dead Sea Scrolls. V. Summary.

I. 1. *Etymology.* The root *rḥṣ* with the same or similar meaning is found also in Ugaritic (*rḥṣ,* "wash"),[1] Arabic (*raḥaḍa,* "wash"),[2] Old South Arabic, (*rḥḍ,* "wash"),[3]

---

rāḥaṣ. W. Bunte, "Waschung," *BHHW,* III, 2137-38; K. Galling, "Bad und Baden," *BRL,* 78-81; F. Hauck, "νίπτω, ἄνιπτος," *TDNT,* IV, 946-48; L. Köhler, *Hebrew Man* (Eng. trans. Nashville, 1956); J. Maringer, "Das Wasser in Kult und Glauben der vorgeschichtlichen Menschen," *Anthropos* 68 (1973) 705-76; E. Netzer, "Ancient Ritual Baths *(miqvaot)* in Jericho," *Jerusalem Cathedra* 2 (1982) 106-9; E. Neufeld, "Hygiene Conditions in Ancient Israel (Iron Age)," *BA* 34 (1971) 42-66; E. Rácz, "Kultische Waschungen bei den Ägyptern und Juden und ihre Verhältnis zur urchristlichen Taufe, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Qumran-Sekte" (diss., Vienna, 1958); P. Reymond, *L'eau, sa vie, et sa signification dans l'AT. SVT* 6 (1958), esp. 228-34; V. Sasson, "*šmn rḥṣ* in the Samaria Ostraca," *JSS* 26 (1981) 1-5; L. E. Stager, "The Finest Olive Oil in Samaria," *JSS* 28 (1983) 241-45; R. de Vaux, *AncIsr,* II, esp. 460-64; *idem, Les sacrifices de l'AT. CahRB* 1 (1964); H. Weippert, "Bad und Baden," *BRL*^{2}, 30-32.
→ בָּשָׂר *bāśār;* טהר *ṭhr;* → כבס *kbs.*

1. *WUS,* no. 2504; *UT,* no. 2323.
2. Wehr, 331.
3. Biella, 486.

Akkadian (*raḫāsu,* "flood, flush"),[4] and Ethiopic (*raḥĕḍa,* "sweat"),[5] as well as in Egyptian Aramaic and in Aramaic papyri (*rḥʿ,* "wash"),[6] and in Egyptian (*rḫt,* "wash").[7]

The variation in the second radical (*ḥ/ḫ*) raises the question of the root's original form. If we accept the common assumption that an original *ḥ* became *ḫ* in Akkadian and Egyptian, we must posit an assimilation occasioned by the *ṣ* or *ḍ*. If, however, the *ḫ* is original, we would be dealing with a dissimilation to *ḥ,* likewise under the influence of the third emphatic radical.[8]

2. *Occurrences and Meaning.* The root *rḥṣ* occurs 72 times in the OT, including two occurrences of the pual and one of the hithpael. In addition, there are two occurrences each of the nouns *raḥaṣ,* "washing," and *raḥṣâ,* "pond" (NRSV "washing"). The semantic field includes the verbs *kbs,* "wash," *šṭp,* "rinse," *ṭhr,* "be clean," *ṭmʾ,* "be unclean," *qdš,* "sanctify," and *ṭbl,* "immerse," as well as *swk,* "anoint," and *kḥl,* "paint." It also includes the terms *ṣōʾâ,* "filth," and *dām,* "bloodguilt." In parallel we find *zkh,* "purify," *zkk,* "cleanse," and *dwḥ,* "rinse," as well as *ṭnp,* "befoul."

In the Ugaritic texts we find 24 occurrences of the verbal root in the G and Gt stems.[9] One of the duties of a son, for example, is to wash his father's garment *(rḥṣ npṣh)* when it is dirty.[10] El orders Keret to stop mourning his childlessness and prepare to offer sacrifice: "Wash yourself and paint yourself *(trtḥṣ wtʾdm),* wash your hands *(rḥṣ ydk),* your arms, [your] fingers up to the shoulder."[11] We are also told that the king washed himself *(yrtḥṣ mlk).*[12]

Most of the occurrences have to do with ʿAnat. After horrible carnage, "virgin ʿAnat washed her hand in a basin" *(bṣʿ trḥṣ ydh btlt ʿnt);*[13] "she washed her hand of the blood of the warriors, her fingers of the blood of the squires."[14] "Water was drawn, and she washed herself with the dew of heaven, with the fat of the earth" ([*t*]*ḥs pn mh wtrḥṣ* [*t*]*l šmn ʾrṣ*).[15] Another text also says that virgin ʿAnat washed herself *(trtḥṣ btlt ʿnt).*[16] Yet another text says that Pǵt, the daughter of Danel, "washes and paints herself" *(trtḥ*[*ṣ*] *wtʾdm)* before setting out to avenge the death of brother Aqhat.[17] One problematic text appears to mean "and she sat upon the serpent and washed herself" (*wtṯb ʿl bṯnt*

4. *AHw,* II, 942-43.
5. *LexLingAeth,* 274-75.
6. *DISO,* 278.
7. *WbÄS,* II, 448.
8. *UT,* no. 2323.
9. Whitaker, 572.
10. *KTU,* 1.17, I, 33; similarly I, 7-8, 23.
11. *KTU,* 1.14, II, 9-10; Keret obeys in III, 52-53.
12. *KTU,* 1.87, 3; cf. 1.41, 3; 1.46, 10; 1.87, 55; 1.105, 5-6; 1.109, 2.
13. *KTU,* 1.3, II, 32ff.; cf. 1.101, 14ff.
14. *KTU,* 1.3, II, 34-35; cf. 1.7, 20-21.
15. *KTU,* 1.3, II, 38-39; IV, 42-43; cf. H.-J. Zobel, *ZAW* 82 (1970) 209-16.
16. *KTU,* 1.13, 18-19.
17. *KTU,* 1.19, IV, 41-42.

trtḫ[ṣ?]).[18] It is also noteworthy that Š'tqt came when Keret died, sat down, and "washed him [clean] of sweat" *(trḥṣ nn bd't),*[19] then force-fed him and thus snatched him back from death. Washing — as this text makes clear — is something that the living do and is associated with life. Dirt and the cold sweat of death, blood and the outward signs of mourning, are washed away. Washing is among the preparations for offering sacrifice or more generally for carrying out a divine command. Washing is both an everyday action and a ceremony that was "a commonplace in Semitic religions."[20] Washing is done with water; afterward, both men and women may paint themselves with cosmetics.

The Samaria ostraca often contain the phrase *nbl šmn rḥṣ,* "a jar of oil for washing,"[21] referring to purified oil meant for cosmetic purposes.[22]

The two occurrences in the Elephantine ostraca are not entirely clear. One text reads *'rḥ'h,*[23] another either *trḥ'nh* or *trḥmnh.*[24] There are four additional occurrences in the Testament of Levi from the Cairo Genizah, referring to the ritual ablutions of the priests (T. Levi 35:4,8; 36:2,10).[25]

The Dead Sea Scrolls contain 18 occurrences of the verb (15 in the Temple Scroll, plus 1QM 14:2; CD 10:11; 11:1) and one of the noun (1QS 3:5).

3. *LXX.* To translate *rḥṣ* the LXX uses *loúein* 41 times, *níptein* 18 times, and *plýnein* 6 times.[26] We also find *apoloúein* (Job 9:30), *aponíptein* (Prov. 30:12), *ekplýnein* (Isa. 4:4), and *cheín* (Job 29:6). The LXX omits the passage Ex. 40:30-32, with 3 occurrences of the verb. The noun *raḥṣâ* is translated with *tó loutrón.* Ps. 60:10(Eng. 8) = 108:10(9) is not translated literally.

II. Washing and Bathing. 1. *Practice.* The common expression *rāḥaṣ bammayim* makes clear that washing is done with water.[27] For added emphasis Job speaks of washing himself "with the water of snow" (Job 9:30; NRSV "soap") — water that is particularly clear or with special cleansing power. The same verse speaks also of washing with "lye" *(bōr).* Hands or feet are washed in a "washbasin" (*sîr,* Ps. 60:10[8] = 108:10[9]). The cultic inventory of the temple includes "basins" (*kîyôr,* Ex. 30:18; 40:30; 2 Ch. 4:6) and "the sea" (*hayyām,* 2 Ch. 4:6).

It is also possible to bathe in a tub in the courtyard of a house (2 S. 11:2; Sus. 15ff.)

---

18. *KTU,* 1.2, III, 20.

19. *KTU,* 1.16, VI, 10.

20. J. Gray, *The KRT Text in the Literature of Ras Shamra. DMOA* 5 (^{2}1964), 36.

21. D. Diringer, *Le iscrizioni antico-ebariche palestinesi* (Florence, 1934): 16.3; 17.3; 18.3; 19.3; 20.3; 21.3; 53.3; 54.2-3; 55.3; 59.1-2.

22. Cf. *KAI,* 186.3; 187.2-3; *ANET,* 321, translates 18.3: "A jar of fine oil"; cf. Sasson; Stager.

23. P. Sachau, *Aramäische Papyrus und Ostraca aus einer jüdischen Militärkolonie zu Elephantine* (Leipzig, 1911), no. 76, I, B, 3.

24. Sachau, no. 76, I, A, 7.

25. Beyer, 694.

26. Hauck, 945-46.

27. See III.1 below; also Neufeld.

or even in a river (Ex. 2:5; 2 K. 5:10,12). This is suggested by the idiom "bathe one's flesh [i.e., body]."[28] The "pool" (Cant. 4:2; 6:6) where sheep and goats were washed was probably also located near a river or pond.

After washing or bathing, the body or skin is anointed (2 S. 12:20; Ezk. 16:9; Ruth 3:3) and the face painted with cosmetics (Ezk. 23:40). The texts from Ugarit also speak of this procedure, and the Samaria ostraca mention cosmetic oil.

The information in biblical and extrabiblical texts is brought to life by the baths found in excavated palaces, as well as the washbasins, bathtubs, and other objects for personal hygiene that have been brought to light.[29]

2. *Washing.* People wash to remove "filth" (Isa. 4:4; Prov. 30:12) or "blood" (Isa. 1:16; 4:4; cf. Ezk. 16:9). Thus a newborn infant is washed, rubbed with salt, and wrapped in swaddling clothes (Ezk. 16:4; a practice, possibly apotropaic, that could still be encountered in Palestine in the early 20th century[30]). Most commonly the texts speak of washing feet, as a rule one's own (Gen. 18:4; 19:2; 24:32; 43:24; Jgs. 19:21; 2 S. 11:8; Cant. 5:3). It is considered an extraordinary gesture of devotion to wash someone else's feet (1 S. 25:41). Other texts speak of washing the face (Gen. 43:31) and hands (Dt. 21:6; Isa. 1:16; cf. Ps. 26:6; 73:13). In ritual texts,[31] the same objects are washed: hands, feet, clothing, and also the whole body — in which case a bath may be meant.

3. *Bathing.* Besides these washings, which used only "the water available in jars or bowls,"[32] there were also complete baths for personal hygiene, as in the case of Pharaoh's daughter (Ex. 2:5), Bathsheba (2 S. 11:2), and Susanna (Sus. 15ff.). The bathing establishments mentioned by Josephus could also be used for cleanliness.[33] When Ahab's chariot was washed, 1 K. 22:38 relates that the prostitutes at the pool of Samaria bathed in the bloody water. Rituals often speak of baths.

4. *Purpose.* People might wash or bathe for a variety of reasons. As in the case of Naomi's advice to Ruth (Ruth 3) and possibly also Bathsheba and Susanna, a woman might wash as part of her toilet to please a man; Ezk. 23:40 describes such a process to attract a lover. In Ezk. 16:9 the bathing and anointing of the young woman may be interpreted as a kind of "fetching the bride"; Zimmerli, however, connects it with the end of the "initial helplessness and natural dependence of the child."[34]

In the case of Pharaoh's daughter, there may also be elements of pleasure and exhilaration: a cool bath is refreshing, just as providing water to wash a guest's feet gives

28. See III.1 below.
29. Weippert.
30. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 338-39.
31. See III below.
32. Galling, 81.
33. *Ant.* 19.7.5.
34. Zimmerli, 340.

comfort and refreshment after the day's journey. But the cleansing effect must not be ignored (cf. Isa. 4:4), just as washing one's feet before going to bed serves primarily to cleanse them (Cant. 5:3).[35] Cleanliness is also associated with health and hygiene, especially in the case of the newborn (Ezk. 16:4).[36] Conversely, dirty clothes and neglect of personal cleanliness are signs of mourning (Gen. 43:31; 2 S. 12:20; cf. 2 S. 19:25[24]).[37]

5. *Figurative Usage.* The aspect of cleanness achieved by washing predominates in figurative usage. The description of the bride's beauty compares her white teeth to a flock of shorn ewes emerging washed from the pool (Cant. 4:2; 6:6), and the eyes of the groom to "doves that bathe in [white] milk" (5:12). Job describes his former prosperity by saying that his "steps were washed with milk" (Job 29:6).

We touch on the religious domain with the desire of the righteous to see vengeance done and "bathe their feet in the blood of the wicked" (Ps. 58:11[10]). One manifestation of wickedness is to think oneself clean while remaining uncleansed (Prov. 30:12). Here the concept of cleanness "is closely related to what is ethically and religiously good,"[38] just as washing one's hands corresponds to removing the evil of one's doings (Isa. 1:16), and, in a late oracle of salvation, the consecration of Israel is represented by the metaphor of Yahweh's washing away the filth of the daughters of Zion (Isa. 4:4). Finally, we cite the figurative idiom "I wash my hands in innocence" (Ps. 26:6; 73:13),[39] because it presupposes the act of cleansing, reinterpreted in a religious and ethical sense. There is no convincing evidence that this statement echoes "the conventional rites at the oath of cleansing."[40] The washing of a corpse described in a Ugaritic text might also be cited here; it might possibly be associated with the custom, attested in the OT, of going unwashed to express mourning.[41]

III. Cultic Ablutions. The various commandments governing cultic and ritual ablutions grew increasingly elaborate and detailed in the course of history. Their retention of stereotyped formulaic language suggests an element of persistent conservatism.

1. *Language.* The expression *rāḥaṣ bammayim* occurs 21 times (Ex. 29:4; 40:12; Lev. 1:9,13; 8:6,21; 15:5-8,10,11,18,21,22,27; 17:15; Nu. 19:19; Dt. 23:12; Ezk. 16:4,9). According to Elliger, this expression reflects "legal usage," because other texts using *rāḥaṣ* "do not mention the water as being self-evident" (cf. Ex. 29:17; Lev. 9:14).[42] This formula is expanded by addition of the object *(ʾeṯ) bᵉśārô* in Lev. 14:9;

---

35. O. Keel, *ZBK* 18, 178.
36. Reymond, 233-34.
37. → VII, 41.
38. → V, 294.
39. Reymond, 232.
40. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1988), 327.
41. See II.4 above.
42. K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* IV (1966), 187-88 n. 53.

15:13,16; 16:4,24,26,28; 22:6; Nu. 19:7,9; without *bammayim,* Lev. 17:16). All these passages may be assigned to Priestly circles. "Stylistically unique in P is the section Ex. 30:17-21, together with the corresponding section Ex. 40:30-32. Here the object, when specified, is 'hands and feet' (30:19,21; 40:31); it is not specified in 30:18; 40:30,32. . . . Only in Ex. 30:20 do we find the totally unique *rḥs mayim.*"[43]

2. *Obligatory Ablutions.* The ablutions required of every Israelite and hence as a rule of every priest can be listed according to their occasion. In first place stands washing to remove uncleanness. Because uncleanness comes through touching or external contact with something unclean, it can be removed by washing or rinsing, following which the person in question is again allowed to visit the sanctuary (2 S. 12:20) or partake of sacred donations (Lev. 22:6). In both the story of David and the story of Ruth, the individual steps in the process — washing, anointing, changing clothes — are identical; but Ruth prepares herself in this way to meet Boaz, whereas David prepares to visit the sanctuary. This observation accords with the general principle that cultic and ritual practices are rooted in the everyday life of the people.

The only directive in the OT given to a group may go back to an archaic "magical procedure"[44] to avert the possible consequences of murder by a person unknown: the elders of the town nearest the scene of the crime kill a heifer, then wash their hands over it and attest: "Our hands did not shed this blood" (Dt. 21:6-7). Von Rad rightly comments that we should picture the hand washing "as originally to be a real and not a symbolic action."[45]

The rituals required of individuals should be understood analogously. The person who sets free the goat for Azazel (Lev. 16:26) or removes the carcass of the sin offering (16:28) must bathe, as well as the one who burns the red heifer (Nu. 19:7-8). Here too the original motivation was "more likely actual uncleanness than the menace of the holy."[46] This category also includes the directives of the ritual law concerning ablutions to remove the uncleanness consequent to disease. We begin with leprosy, because the story of how Naaman the Syrian was cured by washing seven times in the Jordan (2 K. 5:10-14) furnishes a welcome reference to the curative power of water, then conceived in miraculous and magical terms.[47] The "cleanness of the flesh" achieved by washing is more than a simple outward cleansing, and comes to pass without any understanding on Naaman's part of the prophet's command.[48] Lev. 14:8-9 specifies what someone who has been healed of leprosy must do next: wash his clothes, shave off all his hair, and bathe *(rḥṣ)* in water; then he is clean (v. 8; v. 9 is an involved repetition[49]).

---

43. *Ibid.*
44. G. von Rad, *Deuteronomy. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1988), 136.
45. *Ibid.,* 136.
46. Elliger, *HAT* IV, 216.
47. See the general discussion by Maringer.
48. → V, 294.
49. Elliger, *HAT* IV, 174-75.

A very similar procedure is required of one who has eaten what dies of itself or has been torn by wild animals: "He shall wash his clothes and bathe himself in water" (Lev. 17:15-16).

Finally the uncleanness arising from a sexual discharge is removed in the same way: the person affected must wash his or her clothes and bathe his or her body (Lev. 15:5-8,10-11,13,16,18,21-22,27).[50] The camp ordinances have adopted a variant of this procedure: a soldier made unclean by a nocturnal emission must go outside the camp and wash himself with water in the evening; then he may come back into the camp (Dt. 23:11-12[10-11]).

3. *Priestly Ablutions.* In most of the laws, cleansing serves to enable someone to return to the normal social life of the community; the last example, however, is more concerned with the irreconcilable conflict between uncleanness and holiness: the military camp with Yahweh in its midst (v. 15[14]) is holy. Wellhausen gives classic expression to this situation: "The military camp, the cradle of the nation, was also the earliest sanctuary. There was Israel, and there was Yahweh."[51]

The taboo character of holiness explains the requirement that "all who have participated in making the substance used for cleansing . . . are rendered 'unclean' for the day in question . . . and . . . must perform certain ablutions"[52] — the priests according to Nu. 19:7, laypeople according to v. 8 (see also v. 19). But because the priests as cultic functionaries spend substantial time in the sanctuary and are in contact with the holy, they have a particular need to perform punctiliously the appropriate ritual ablutions.

First of all, the investiture of Aaron and his sons is preceded by "a washing, obviously a plunge bath, of the priestly candidates,"[53] performed by Moses, making the priests ritually clean (Ex. 29:4; 40:12; Lev. 8:6). The fundamental process here described is repeated every time the priests enter the tent of meeting with Moses and Aaron (Ex. 30:19ff.; 40:31-32[54]) and when Aaron by himself enters or leaves the sanctuary on the great Day of Atonement (Lev. 16:4,24): before putting on the sacred vestments, he must wash his body with water. The same language appears in the requirement that he remove the sacred vestments before leaving the sanctuary, bathe, and put on other clothes before offering the burnt offering. Yahweh's appearance in the temple has made the sacred vestments so holy that they may not leave the temple, and thorough ablutions are required before putting them on and after taking them off, lest their holiness imperil the priest who wears them. To this end, "a basin" *(kîyôr)* or "the sea" *(hayyām)* was installed in the temple (Ex. 30:18; 40:30; 2 Ch. 4:6). We note, however, that Ex. 30:19,21; 40:31 speak of washing only the priests' hands and feet in this basin.

---

50. See W. Bunte, *BHHW,* III, 1581, who assumes that Lev. 15:13 refers to a plunge bath.
51. J. Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte* (Berlin, [9]1958), 24.
52. M. Noth, *Numbers. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1968), 141.
53. Elliger, *HAT* IV, 116.
54. M. Noth, *Exodus. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1962), 282: "secondary sections."

The Testament of Levi assembles all these requirements in a single passage devoted to priestly ablutions (35:1-8).[55] First comes a bath, after which the priest puts on the vestments and washes his hands and feet. The washing of hands and feet is repeated whenever something is to be placed on the altar.

For the sake of completeness, we shall also mention the priest's washing of the entrails and legs of the burnt offering, an action perhaps carried out originally by the person providing the animal, because nothing unclean may be offered to Yahweh[56] (Ex. 29:17; Lev. 1:9,13; 8:21; 9:14; cf. 2 Ch. 4:6; T. Levi 35:22-38[57]).

IV. Dead Sea Scrolls. The many basins discovered in the excavations at Qumran suggest that ritual ablutions and baths "played a central role" there — possibly in part because of the climate.[58] If we may rely on Josephus's information about the Essenes, members of the community washed daily before the common meal.[59] Because Josephus says that the dining room was considered to be "like a sacred precinct," this meal may have had a sacral character, so that ablutions before and after eating appeared appropriate.

The texts describe a cleansing process required after battle, in which those who fought washed their clothes and washed from their bodies the blood of the slain (1QM 14:2-3, *wrḥṣw mdm pgry h'šmh*). This description fits with the instructions in Nu. 8:7; 19:19; 31:19. The Community Rule speaks of a "water of washing/ablution" (1QS 3:5, *my rḥḥ*) that cleanses and washes away guilt.

The prohibitions in CD 10:11 and 11:1, although consonant with the late P texts of the OT, go beyond them: the former prohibits bathing with water that is dirty or less than the amount needed to cover the bather; the latter stipulates that "one who goes down to bathe may drink where he stands, but may not fill a vessel." Here we recognize casuistic elaboration.

V. Summary. In the ancient Near East, washing was an everyday activity; as foot washing illustrates, however, it could also signify a friendly welcome to a guest entering the house. Because by removing uncleanness washing produces cleanness, ablutions clearly found their way into the archaic cult at an early date. Here there was established an association of washing with holiness; for holiness too was considered a "contagious" and life-threatening condition, which had to be effaced before reentry into everyday life. Here we can see that both uncleanness and holiness were conceived materialistically; appropriate ablutions could therefore remove these conditions, enabling one to escape the domain of holiness or uncleanness (e.g., due to leprosy) and enter the realm of normal life. There is accordingly a mysterious connection between outward bodily cleanliness and cultic cleanness.[60]

---

55. Beyer, 198.
56. Reymond, 230; Elliger, *HAT* I/4, 37.
57. Beyer, 199ff.
58. J. Maier, *Die Texte vom Toten Meer,* II (Munich, 1960), 16-17.
59. *B.J.* 2.129-30.
60. Noth, *Exodus,* 230, 237.

Several passages still reveal how the archaic practices were preserved, handed on, and finally incorporated into the latest P legislation. The law concerning the ashes of the red heifer betrays this survival in a tension within the present text of Nu. 19:1-10: Noth points out the strange "co-operation of so many different people" and theorizes that "the introduction of the priest could already represent a more advanced stage," that an originally materialistic magical ceremony became associated outwardly with the cult of Yahweh.[61] According to de Vaux, these ablutions represent "an archaic rite which lived on side by side with the official religion; . . . it was incorporated, at a very late date, into the Priestly legislation."[62] In the section dealing with leprosy, also, two different rituals have been combined: Lev. 14:1-9 and 14:10-32.[63]

The recognition that many ritual laws have a long prehistory is certainly valuable, but it appears more important to ask why P included them, using them to develop and extend the Priestly legislative corpus. On this question, all critics agree that P was concerned above all to preserve and strengthen the postexilic community. Toward this end, two things were needed: clear, unambiguous separation from the surrounding world, and internal consolidation that dealt precisely with a wide range of detail.[64] This separation of the Jewish community from its "gentile" environment was linked with inculcation of the "idea of holiness." De Vaux sees the position of the "Law of Purity" (Lev. 11–16) preceding the Holiness Code (Lev. 17–26) as a further expression of this process, representing "the two aspects . . . of that holiness which is demanded by God."[65]

As the requirements stipulated in the law increased, so did the importance of the priestly instruction, through which the followers of Yahweh learned precisely what they must and must not do. Thus the priestly office became even more exalted. Moses "brings" the priests to the washing that precedes their investiture (Lev. 8:6). The expression *hiqrîḇ*[66] is intended to cause this action to be interpreted "after the analogy of the sacrificial act" for which the same expression was employed, just as the verb *rḥṣ* is used by P "only of the priests and portions of the sacrificial victim."[67]

Zobel

61. *Numbers,* 141.
62. *AncIsr,* II, 462.
63. *Ibid.*
64. See also Köhler, 121-22; → II, 323.
65. *AncIsr,* II, 460.
66. → קרב *qrb.*
67. Elliger, *HAT* IV, 116.

רָחַק rāḥaq; רָחוֹק rāḥôq; מֶרְחָק merḥāq; רָחֵק rāḥēq; רַחִיק raḥîq

I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences. II. General Usage: 1. Space; 2. Time. III. Theological Usage: 1. Distance from the Holy; 2. Exile and Restoration; 3. Individual Distance from God; 4. God's Omniscience, Omnipresence, and Mercy; 5. Distance from Evil. IV. LXX. V. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. 1. *Etymology.* The root *rḥq,* with the meaning "(be) distant, far," is Common Semitic. Besides Hebrew, it is found in Ugaritic,[1] Aramaic,[2] Syriac,[3] Old South Arabic,[4] Ethiopic, and Akkadian.[5] For "distant," Arabic uses the root *b'd;* nevertheless, the designation of a kind of wine as *raḥīq* — probably "wine from afar"[6] — suggests earlier use of the root *rḥq,* "distant," in Arabic as well.

In all cases the spatial meaning of the root predominates; but the temporal meaning is found also, not only in Hebrew but also in Ugaritic and Akkadian.[7] In Aramaic the verb often serves as a legal term for "renounce"; the noun *mrḥq* is also used in this sense.[8] As in Hebrew, the adj. *raḥîq* is often used as the opposite of *qrb,* "near."[9] In the context of familial relationships, it can mean "alien."[10]

2. *Occurrences.* The root occurs a total of 163 times in the OT; the verb occurs 58 times, mostly (30 times) in the Writings. The verb is often construed with *min:* 23 of the 29 occurrences of the qal, 17 of the 24 occurrences of the hiphil. The piel occurs only 4 times, the niphal just once (Eccl. 12:6 [textually uncertain]).

With 85 occurrences the adj. *rāḥôq,* "distant," is by far the most frequent derivative; it is especially common in the book of Isaiah (18 times). Combined with *min* (*mērāḥôq;* 41 times), it means "from afar." Six times, primarily in late texts, *mērāḥôq* is preceded by l^e, and once by *'aḏ* (Isa. 57:9). In Ezr. 3:13 and 2 Ch. 26:15, we even find

---

rāḥaq. M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography X," *Bibl* 53 (1972) 386-403, esp. 387-88; M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, "Beschriftete Lungen- und Lebermodelle aus Ugarit," *Ugaritica* VI (1969) 165-79; S. Fraenkel, *Die aramäischen Fremdwörter im Arabischen* (Leiden, 1886); E. Jenni, *HP,* esp. 74-75; J. Kühlewein, "רחק *rḥq* fern sein," *THAT,* II, 768-71; W. E. Lemke, "The Near and the Distant God," *JBL* 100 (1981) 541-55; H. Preisker, "μακράν, μακρόθεν," *TDNT,* IV, 372-74.

1. *WUS,* no. 2505; *UT,* no. 2324.
2. *DISO,* 168, 178-79.
3. *LexSyr,* 725.
4. Biella, 486.
5. *AHw,* II, 971-72, 995-96.
6. Fraenkel, 158.
7. See Dietrich and Loretz, 172; *AHw,* II, 971, 996.
8. See, respectively, *DISO,* 278, 160.
9. *DISO,* 265.
10. *DISO,* 279.

ʿaḏ-lᵉmērāḥôq. When the meaning is spatial, *mērāḥôq* can be replaced by *mēʾereṣ rᵉḥōqâ* (7 times). We find *rāḥôq* used both attributively and predicatively.

The Biblical Aramaic adj. *raḥîq,* corresponding to Heb. *rāḥôq,* appears in Ezr. 6:6. The verbal adj. *rāḥēq* likewise occurs only once (Ps. 73:27).

More frequent is the nominal derivative *merḥāq,* "distance." Its occurrences are concentrated in the prophetic literature (7 in Isaiah, 5 in Jeremiah, once each in Ezekiel and Zechariah). Often *merḥāq* is combined with *ʾereṣ,* especially in the phrase *mēʾereṣ (ham)merḥāq.*

II. General Usage. The root *rḥq* can denote both spatial and temporal distance.

1. *Space.* When a spatial sense is conveyed, the "distance" involved may be (as in English) literal and physical or figurative and psychological.

a. *Verb.* The meaning of the verb in the qal is "be distant, be far, move away, keep away," as in Isa. 59:9: *rāḥaq mišpāṭ mimmennû,* "Justice has departed from us," or Lam. 1:16: *rāḥaq mimmennû mᵉnaḥēm,* "A comforter is far from me." Noteworthy are Dt. 12:21 and 14:24: *kî-yirḥaq mimmᵉḵā hammāqôm,* "If the place is too far from you."

The meaning of the hiphil differs only in part from that of the qal. It can mean "be distant" (Gen. 44:4), so that the inf. abs. *harḥēq* can be used adverbially with the meaning "far off" (Gen. 21:16; Ex. 33:7; Josh. 3:16); it can also mean "go away" (Josh. 8:4; Jgs. 18:22; Job 19:13). Most often, however, it means "remove" or "keep far"; the texts in question are limited to the later prophetic writings, Psalms, Job, and Proverbs (Jer. 27:10; Ezk. 11:16; Joel 2:20; 4:6[Eng. 3:6]; Ps. 88:9,19[8,18]; 103:12; Job 11:14; 13:21; 22:23; Prov. 4:24; 5:8; 22:15; 30:8).

The piel is usually causative: "remove, keep at a distance" (Isa. 6:12; Ezk. 43:9), or "enlarge (borders)" (Isa. 26:15). The expression *wᵉlibbô riḥaq mimmennî* in Isa. 29:13 is more difficult to interpret. It is usually translated "its heart is far from me," or an intensive sense is proposed, "be far distant."[11] But the meaning of the piel elsewhere should also be considered: "and it [the people] removes its heart from me." This interpretation would be comparable to Job 17:4, "For you have kept their heart far *(ṣāp̱antā)* from understanding *(miśśāḵel),*" and Jgs. 19:22, "These appeased their heart" *(hēmmâ mêṭîḇîm ʾeṯ-libbām).*

b. *Adjective.* Like the verb, the adj. *rāḥôq* can be construed with following *min;* then it means "far from," either concretely (e.g., Dt. 20:15) or figuratively (e.g., Ps. 119:155). Frequently, *min* introduces *rāḥôq: mērāḥôq,* "from far away, from a distance." Abraham see the place where he is to offer sacrifice "far away" (Gen. 22:4). Texts frequently speak of coming or bringing from far away (Dt. 28:49; Isa. 5:26; 43:6; 49:12; 60:4,9; Hab. 1:8) or "from a distant country" *(mēʾereṣ rᵉḥôqâ,* Dt. 29:21[22]; Josh. 9:6,9; 1 K. 8:41 par. 2 Ch. 6:32; 2 K. 20:14; Isa. 39:3). The separative meaning of the prep. *min* can be attenuated in the combination *mērāḥôq,* as in the expression *ʿmd mērāḥôq,* "stand at a distance" (Ex. 2:4 [*yṣb* hithpael]; 20:18,21; 1 S. 26:13; 2 K. 2:7),

11. *HAL,* III, 1222.

also used figuratively (Isa. 59:14; Ps. 38:12[11]). In Isa. 22:3 and 23:7 *mērāḥôq* is best translated "far away."

c. *With qrb.* The roots *rḥq* and → קרב *qrb* are often used as a contrastive pair, less commonly in the case of the verb (Isa. 54:14: both qal; Isa. 46:13: *rḥq* qal, *qrb* piel) than in the case of the adj. *rāḥôq*. The antithesis *rāḥôq/qārôb* is often used as a hendiadys expressing a totality: Dt. 13:8(7); Isa. 33:13; 57:19; Jer. 25:26; 48:24; Ezk. 22:5; Est. 9:20; Dnl. 9:7. In such cases echoes of the geographical notion are sometimes still heard, as in 1 K. 8:46 ("to a land far off or near") and Ezk. 6:12 ("those far off shall die of pestilence, those nearby shall fall by the sword"). Prov. 27:10 uses *qārôḇ* and *rāḥôq* antithetically: "Better is a neighbor who is nearby than a brother who is far away." Jer. 12:2 is similar: "You are near in their mouths yet far from their heart." One may also cite Jer. 23:23: "Am I a God nearby *(miqqārōḇ)* . . . and not (rather) a God far off *(mērāḥôq)*?" Dt. 30:11-14 emphasizes that God's commandment is not far away (i.e., unattainable) but very near.

d. *Noun.* The noun *merḥāq* appears almost exclusively in prophetic and poetic texts. An exception is 2 S. 15:17: *wayya'amᵉḏû bêṯ hammerḥāq,* "they stopped at the last house." Most of the expressions using *merḥāq* are analogous to those using *rāḥôq*. The word *mimmerḥāq* can mean "from far away" (Isa. 10:3; 30:27; Jer. 5:15; Ezk. 23:40; Ps. 138:6; Prov. 31:14) but also "(to a) far away (place)" (Isa. 17:13) or "far distant" (Jer. 31:10: *bā'îyîm mimmerḥāq,* "in the coastlands far away"). The pl. *merḥaqqîm* means "far countries, distances" (Isa. 8:9; 33:17; Jer. 8:19; Zec. 10:9).

2. *Time.* While the spatial meaning strongly predominates, in a few instances — limited to the adj. *rāḥôq* — *rḥq* can also have temporal meaning, sometimes referring to the future, sometimes to the past.

Statements concerning the future are found in 2 S. 7:19 (par. 1 Ch. 17:17), Yahweh's promise to the house of David, a promise that will endure to the distant future *(lᵉmērāḥôq),* and in Ezk. 12:27, which pillories those who seek to evade the message of the prophets by saying, "The visions that he sees are for many days ahead *(lᵉyāmîm rabbîm);* he prophesies for distant times *(lᵉ'ittîm rᵉḥôqôṯ).*"

The past is the subject of 2 K. 19:25 (= Isa. 37:26); Isa. 25:1; and 22:11b: "But you did not look to (*nbṭ* hiphil) him who did it; you did not see (*r'h* qal) him who planned *(yāṣar*] it long ago *(mērāḥôq).*" In 2 K. 19:25 we read of Yahweh's plan determined long ago *(mērāḥôq),* planned *(yāṣar)* from days of old *(lᵉmîmê qedem).* Deutero-Isaiah uses comparable language, speaking of Yahweh's message declared[12] of old: Isa. 45:21 (*miqqeḏem* par. *mē'āz*); 46:10 *(mērē'šîṯ* par. *miqqeḏem); 48:3 (mē'āz);* etc.

III. Theological Usage. With statements about Yahweh's plan determined in the past, we are already in the midst of the theological usage of the root *rḥq*. The texts cited are exilic or postexilic, and theological statements using *rḥq* are concentrated in that late period. Most are in the later prophetic writings (Deutero-Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel) and the Psalms. A few instances, however, appear in earlier traditions.

---

12. → נגד *ngd,* IV.1.c.

1. *Distance from the Holy.* These earlier traditions include language that bears witness to the danger of God's close presence. The Sinai pericope repeatedly describes the mountain of God as holy and unapproachable (e.g., Ex. 19:12-13). This tradition includes the terrifying phenomena associated with the theophany, which force the people to stand at a distance (Ex. 20:18,21), while Moses alone draws near[13] to the thick darkness[14] enshrouding God. According to Ex. 24:1-2, Aaron, Nadab, Abihu, and the seventy elders who go up to Sinai with Moses prostrate themselves at a distance *(mērāḥôq);* Moses alone comes near Yahweh.

When crossing the Jordan, the people must not come too near *('al-tiqrᵉḇû)* the ark, from which emanate perilous forces (cf. 2 S. 6:6-7); they must maintain a distance *(rāḥôq yihyeh)* of some two thousand cubits (Josh. 3:4). The tent of meeting *('ōhel mô'ēḏ)*[15] is set up far off *(harḥēq)* from the camp (Ex. 33:7). Fear of the holy probably also explains why the fifty prophetic disciples stand at a distance before Elisha receives the spirit from Elijah (2 K. 2:7).

2. *Exile and Restoration.* Many oracles of the prophets announce that Yahweh is sending a people or disaster from a distance as a judgment upon Israel (Isa. 5:26; 10:3; Jer. 4:16; 5:15; Hab. 1:8); this motif is borrowed by Dt. 28:49. But the same fate may also await Israel's enemies (Isa. 13:5; 30:27). Just as the ancestors of Israel already went far from Yahweh (Jer. 2:5; the Levites, Ezk. 44:10), so does the present generation (Isa. 29:13; cf. Jer. 12:2). Here too belongs Ezk. 8:6: *lᵉroḥᵒqâ mē'al miqdāšî,* which should be translated: "by distancing themselves from my sanctuary," not "to drive me far from my sanctuary."[16]

Yahweh threatens to send far away from their homeland the people who have gone far from him (Isa. 6:12; Jer. 27:10); conversely, removal of the "northerner" (Joel 2:20) means deliverance for Israel. For Israel, taken into distant exile (Ezk. 11:16; cf. Joel 4:6[3:6]), a deliverer from afar is promised (Isa. 46:11): "I am calling an eagle from the east *(mimmizrāḥ*], from a far country *(mē'ereṣ merḥāq*] the man for my purpose."[17] This paves the way for Israel to be returned from afar to its homeland (Isa. 43:6; 49:12; 60:4,9; Jer. 30:10; 46:27). This act of deliverance is to be proclaimed to the farthest coastlands (Jer. 31:10; cf. Isa. 49:1; 66:19). Even those who are far off will come to help build the temple of Yahweh (Zec. 6:15).

3. *Individual Distance from God.* Individual piety thrives on the nearness of God. The afflicted psalmist often laments that God (or God's help) is far away (Ps. 10:1; cf. Isa. 59:9,11,14) and has forsaken[18] the supplicant (Ps. 22:2[1]), or prays God not to be

---

13. → נגשׁ *ngš,* III.1.a.
14. → ערפל *'ᵃrāpel.*
15. → אהל *'ōhel,* III.3.
16. See W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1929), 218, 240; contra NRSV; cf. G. Fohrer, *Ezechiel. HAT* XIII (1955), 49.
17. → עצה *'ēṣâ.*
18. → עזב *'āzaḇ.*

distant (22:12,20[11,19]; 35:22; 38:22[21]; 71:12). Alternatively, the worshiper is persuaded that Yahweh is far from the wicked (Prov. 15:29; Ps. 119:155; cf. Jer. 12:2) or that they are far from Yahweh (Ps. 119:150; cf. Job 21:16; 22:18) and therefore perish (Ps. 73:27).

This viewpoint probably explains what those remaining in the land say concerning the exiles (Ezk. 11:15): "They are far from Yahweh." This means that they are far from the place of God's presence, but also that because in their wickedness they went far from Yahweh (Ezk. 8:6; 44:10), he has now removed them far from his presence.[19]

The prayer in Job 13:21 is unique: "Withdraw your hand far from me, and do not let your terror terrify me."

To those who suppose themselves far from Yahweh, the prophet declares (Isa. 46:12-13; cf. 54:14): "I bring near my deliverance, it is not far off" *(qērabṯî ṣiḏqāṯî lōʼ tirḥāq).*

4. *God's Omniscience, Omnipresence, and Mercy.* God's omniscience is spoken of comprehensively by Ps. 139; v. 2 states, "You discern my thoughts from far away." God's omnipresence, which encompasses both near and far, is introduced by Jer. 23:23 with the antithesis *qārôḇ/rāḥôq.* God's commandment is not too hard or too far away; it is very near, so that it can be observed (Dt. 30:11-14). Ps. 103:12 vividly depicts the distance between human sin and divine mercy as the distance between sunrise and sunset *(mizrāḥ* par. *maʿarāḇ).*

5. *Distance from Evil.* In wisdom literature, especially, we find admonitions to keep distant from evil: from false charges (Ex. 23:7), from devious talk (Prov. 4:24; cf. 30:8), from the strange woman (5:8). Similar admonitions are found in Job 11:14 and 22:23.

IV. LXX. The LXX uses a variety of translations for *rḥq.* For *rāḥôq,* the fossilized adverbial acc. *makrán* claims the greatest share, with 30 occurrences (plus Aram. *raḥîq* in Ezr. 6:6); but the locative adv. *makróthen* (24 times) is almost as common. There are also 11 occurrences of the locative adv. *pórrōthen* and 6 of *pórrō.* Passive forms of the verb *makrýnein* appear twice; an active form is used for the verbal adj. *rāḥēq.* When a temporal meaning is present, clarifying translations are sometimes used: *ap' archḗs* (Isa. 22:11), *pálai* (Isa. 37:26), *diá chrónou polloú* (Isa. 49:1, though the MT is not meant temporally). In Prov. 31:10 the translation correctly conveys the sense of *rāḥôq min: timiṓtera,* "more precious": a capable wife is "far more precious than coral."

To translate the verb, the LXX frequently uses *makrýnein:* 7 times for the qal, 6 for the hiphil. While active forms are chosen for the hiphil and the piel (once), passive forms predominate for the qal. For the rest, the spectrum of verbs used to convey the sense of removal, separation, and distance is very broad, with or without an intensifying adverb *(makrán, makróteron, makróthen, pórrō).* To mention only the commonest verbs: *aphístēmi* is used both with *makrán* (3 times for the qal, once for the hiphil) and

19. Zimmerli, 261.

without (5 times for the qal, once for the hiphil); *apéchein* with an adverb represents the qal once and the hiphil once, without an adverb it represents the qal 4 times and the hiphil once. The verb may even be omitted entirely: we find *makrán* alone 4 times, *pórrō* and *makróthen* once each.

For the noun *merḥāq,* we find the same translations as for the adj. *rāḥôq,* but with differing frequencies: first comes *makróthen* (7 times), followed by *pórrōthen* (5 times); only twice is *makrán* chosen, and *makróteron* and *pórrō* once each. Temporal meaning is made explicit by *diá chrónou polloú* (Isa. 30:27 — spatial in the MT). The phrase *merḥaqqê-'āreṣ* (Isa. 8:9) is translated *éōs eschátou tḗs gḗs.*

V. Dead Sea Scrolls. Usage of *rḥq* in the Dead Sea Scrolls does not differ from that in the OT. The qal appears 5 times: in 1QS 1:4; 5:15 (twice), it means "keep far from," in 6:16, "depart from" (par. *qrb* qal). Alluding to Mic. 7:11, CD 4:12 says: "The wall has been built, the boundary is far away." The piel infinitive appears in 1QH 14:21, in parallel with the piel infinitive of *qrb* (l. 20, restored). In 1Q36 fr. 7, 3 we appear to have the niphal in parallel with the niphal of *qrb.*

The adj. *rāḥôq* appears 10 times. The priests are to blow at a distance (*mērāḥôq,* 1QM 9:7). In a lament (1QH 9:6) *mērāḥôq* parallels *miṣṣad,* "aside." In CD 10:16 *rāḥôq* denotes a distance. The Temple Scroll uses *rāḥôq* in 30:6; 31:11; 33:9; 46:15; 52:17; 62:12; 66:4. The noun *merḥāq* appears in 1QpHab 3:10: "And from afar they come, from the isles of the sea."

Wächter

ריב *rîḇ;* מְרִיבָה *mrîḇâ*

I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences. II. Usage: 1. Quarrel; 2. Accuse; 3. Wisdom Literature and Prophecy; 4. Litigation; 5. Job; 6. Prophetic Lawsuit. III. 1. LXX; 2. Sirach; 3. Dead Sea Scrolls.

---

rîḇ. H. J. Boecker, *Redeformen des Rechtslebens in AT. WMANT* 14 ([2]1970); P. Bovati, *Ristabilire la giustizia. AnBibl* 110 (1986); R. W. Cowley, "Technical Terms in Biblical Hebrew?" *TynB* 37 (1986) 22-29; D. R. Daniels, "Is There a 'Prophetic Lawsuit' Genre?" *ZAW* 99 (1987) 339-60; B. Gemser, "The *Rîb-* or Controversy-Pattern in Hebrew Mentality," *SVT* 3 (1955), 120-37; J. Harvey, *Le plaidoyer prophétique contre Israël après la rupture de l'alliance* (Bruges, 1967); *idem,* "Le 'Rîb-Pattern' réquisitoire prophétique sur la rupture de l'alliance," *Bibl* 43 (1962) 172-96; F. Hesse, "Wurzelt die prophetische Gerichtsrede im israelitischen Kult?" *ZAW* 65 (1954) 45-53; H. B. Huffmon, "The Covenant Lawsuit in the Prophets," *JBL* 78 (1959) 285-95; H. Junker, "Textkritische, formkritische und traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Os 4,1-10," *BZ* 4 (1960) 165-73; H.-J. Kraus, *Die prophetische Verkündigung des Rechts in Israel. ThS* 51 (1957); H. Krszyna, "Literarische Struktur von Os 2,4-17," *BZ* 13 (1969) 41-59; G. Liedke, *Gestalt und Bezeichnung alttestamentlicher Rechtssätze. WMANT* 39 (1971), esp. 90; idem, "ריב *rîḇ* streiten," *THAT,* II, 771-77; J. Limburg, "The Root ריב and the Prophetic Lawsuit Speeches," *JBL* 88 (1969) 291-304; G. Many, "Der Rechtsstreit mit Gott *(rib)*

I. 1. *Etymology.* Heb. *rîb* is related etymologically to Arab. *rāba,* "disturb," and probably also to Akk. *râbu,* "replace,"[1] but almost certainly not to Syr. *rûḇ,* "resound, shout," since the latter has a medial *w.* The root is attested in Old Aramaic and possibly also in the Ugaritic PN *yrb'm,* "the ancestral god (uncle) brings justice."[2]

2. *Occurrences.* In the OT the verb occurs 66 times in the qal and twice in the hiphil (ptcp.); the noun *rîḇ,* "quarrel, lawsuit," occurs 62 times. In addition, the noun *yārîḇ,* "adversary," occurs twice (in Jer. 18:19 the correct reading is *rîḇî,* "my [legal] case"), as does *m^e^rîḇâ,* which is also a toponym.

II. Usage. 1. *Quarrel.* In some instances *rîḇ* simply means "quarrel." Such a dispute can involve two individuals (Ex. 21:18) or several persons. Typical of the latter are disputes concerning pasture and well rights. For example, the herders of Abraham and the herders of Lot quarreled over the available pastureland. Abraham said, "Let there be no strife *(m^e^rîḇâ*]," and they reached an amicable settlement (Gen. 13:7-8). Later the Philistines quarreled with the Israelites over water (Gen. 26:20-21); the wells in question were named *'ēśeq,* "Contention," and *śiṭnâ,* "Enmity." A third well, over which there was no quarrel, was named *r^e^ḥōḇôṯ,* "Room" (v. 22).

This meaning is even stronger in the context of the military conflict in Jgs. 11:25: "Does Balak have a quarrel (*rîḇ* qal) or war (*lḥm* niphal) with Israel?" In Jgs. 12:2, similarly, *rîḇ* denotes the "conflict" of Jephthah with the Ammonites (cf. *hillāḥēm* in v. 1). In Ps. 18:44(Eng. 43) *rîḇê 'ām* is textually uncertain (2 S. 22:44 reads *'ammî*).

2. *Accuse.* Other passages view quarrels unilaterally from the perspective of one of the parties. These texts are already moving into the domain of legal disputes: *rîḇ* takes on the nuance of "accuse, upbraid" (according to Limburg, the basic meaning of the root). Jacob became angry and began to upbraid (or accuse) Laban (Gen. 31:36). The quarrel was settled by a covenant (vv. 44ff.).

Elsewhere an individual always confronts a group. The people accused Moses of

---

im Hiobbuch" (diss., Munich, 1970), with bibliog.; G. E. Mendenhall, *Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (Pittsburgh, 1955); K. Nielsen, *Yahweh as Prosecutor and Judge. JSOTSup* 9 (1978); M. O'Rourke Boyle, "The Covenant Lawsuit of the Prophet Amos," *VT* 21 (1971) 338-62; M. de Roche, "Yahweh's *rîb* Against Israel," *JBL* 102 (1983) 563-74; L. Ruppert, "Das Motiv der Versuchung durch Gott in vordeuteronomischer Tradition," *VT* 22 (1972) 55-63; B. Schwartz, "Psalm 50," *Shnaton* 3 (1978/79) 77-106; A. van Selms, "Motivated Interrogative Sentences in the Book of Job," *Sem* 6 (1978) 28-35; E. Suganuma, "The Covenant *Rib* Form in Jer Ch. 2," *Journal of the College of Dairy Agriculture* 4 (1972) 121-54; W. Vogels, *La promesse royale de Yahweh préparatoire à l'alliance* (Ottawa, 1970); E. von Waldow, *Der traditionsgeschichtliche Hintergrund der prophetischen Gerichtsreden. BZAW* 85 (1963); E. B. Wilson, "*Rîb* in Israel's Historical and Legal Traditions" (diss., Drew, 1970); E. Würthwein, "Der Ursprung der prophetischen Gerichtsrede," *ZTK* 49 (1952) 1-16.

1. *AHw,* II, 978-79.

2. *KAI,* 224.17,26; *WUS,* nos. 1235, 2478; *UT,* no. 2330; for a different analysis see *PNU,* 179; → רבב/רבה *rāḇaḇ/rāḇâ.*

having failed to provide water (Ex. 17:2). The site is called Massah and Meribah (v. 7); the parallel narrative in Nu. 20 speaks only of Meribah (v. 13). Here we probably have a secondary interpretation of an ancient toponym: "nomadic shepherds of the wilderness used to assemble at the spring of Meribah and there determine their 'disputes at law.'"[3] Dt. 33:8 provides a totally different explanation of the name: at Meribah Yahweh contended *(rîḇ)* with Levi and put him to the test. The allusion is totally obscure. The Judah aphorism in the preceding verse says that Judah "contended" for the people with his hands — whatever this passage refers to, the contention was not verbal.

In Jgs. 8:1 the Ephraimites upbraid Gideon; Jgs. 21:22 presupposes that the fathers and brothers of the captured women accused the Benjaminites of severe abuse. Finally, Nehemiah says on several occasions that he "called to account" the nobles and officials (Neh. 5:7; 13:11,17,25); the context shows that he accused them of serious misconduct. Nothing is said, however, about legal proceedings.

3. *Wisdom Literature and Prophecy.* Wisdom literature often warns against strife and contention *(māḏôn).* Strife is presented as the antithesis of the ideal of self-control (Prov. 15:18; 17:14). Strife is folly and leads to flogging (18:6). It is the consequence of anger (30:33); a quarrelsome person kindles strife (26:21). One should not let fly like a fool but refrain from strife (20:3) and avoid meddling in the quarrel of another (26:17). A dry morsel with quiet is better than a plentiful repast with strife (17:1).

The combination of *rîḇ* and *māḏôn* appears also in Hab. 1:3, where the prophet laments the destruction and violence around him. In Ps. 55:10(9) the psalmist laments that *rîḇ* and violence *(ḥāmās)* rule the city. Isa. 58:4 conjoins *rîḇ* and *maṣṣâ,* "brawling": under such circumstances, fasting is futile. According to Jer. 15:10, the prophet is "a man of *rîḇ* and *māḏôn,*" i.e., an object of contention.

4. *Litigation.* In most cases *rîḇ* involves litigation, literal or figurative; it can also refer to individual elements of legal proceedings. In Dt. 17:8 the qualification "within your gates" (NRSV "in your towns") makes this clear; the Covenant Code speaks of witnesses and partiality in legal proceedings (Ex. 23:2,3,6). Dt. 19:17 requires both parties to a dispute to appear before the priests and judges and produce their witnesses (cf. Ezk. 44:24). In Dt. 21:5 (a secondary addition to a law that originally spoke only of elders[4]), the priests settle cases of dispute and assault (cf. the similar provision in 11QT 63:4). Dt. 25:1 speaks of litigating a dispute *(rîḇ).* According to 2 S. 15:2,4, Absalom sought to replace the king as judge in the land and decide lawsuits. In 2 Ch. 19:8,10, Jehoshaphat admonishes the judges to follow correct procedure in deciding all cases. Prov. 25:8 warns against bringing a dispute hastily into court (cf. 3:30). Lam. 3:36 lists subversion of justice among the afflictions of the land.

---

3. M. Noth, *Exodus. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1962), 140.

4. J. Buchholz, *Die Ältesten Israels im Deuteronomium. GTA* 36 (1988) 69-70; see also comms.

We find the same meaning, albeit often in a figurative sense, when the verb *rîḇ* has the noun *rîḇ* as its object: "bring a legal action to a just conclusion, vindicate someone." For example, David says to Saul: "Yahweh shall therefore be our judge *(dayyān)* and give sentence *(špṭ)* between me and you. . . . He shall plead my cause *(weyārēḇ 'eṯ-rîḇî)* and vindicate me against you *(yišpeṭēnî mîyāḏeḵā)*" (1 S. 24:16[15]). Isa. 1:23 charges the leaders in Jerusalem with refusing to vindicate *(špṭ)* the orphan and to hear the cause *(rîḇ)* of the widow.

The semantic proximity of *rîḇ* to *špṭ* in these two texts is clear. The same usage appears in Ps. 43:1: "Vindicate *(špṭ)* me, O God, and defend my cause against an ungodly people," and in Mic. 7:9, where the prophet expresses his hope that God will vindicate him. Ps. 35:23 is similar; v. 1 also uses the expression *rîḇâ 'eṯ-yerîḇay,* "contend with those who contend with me" (cf. Isa. 49:25). In Ps. 74:22 the psalmist prays, "O God, plead your cause" against the scoffing of the impious.

Ps. 119:154 prays, "Plead my cause *(rîḇâ rîḇî)* and redeem *(g'l)* me," juxtaposing *rîḇ* with the verb → גאל *gā'al,* which also has legal overtones. According to Jer. 50:34, Yahweh is the *gō'ēl* of Israel and will vigorously defend Israel's cause against Babylon. The speaker of Lam. 3:58 says, "You have taken up my cause, O Yahweh, you have redeemed *(g'l)* my life." Isa. 19:20 uses *môšîa',* "savior," and *rāḇ,* "defender(?)," almost synonymously: God will send the Egyptians a savior, who will deliver them (MT; ***BHS*** reads *werāḇ,* "he will contend [for them]"). Yahweh defends the cause of Israel and takes vengeance *(nqm)* for them (Jer. 51:36). According to Prov. 22:23, God pleads the cause of the poor; according to 23:11, God is the *gō'ēl* of orphans and pleads their cause against those who remove landmarks. These texts employ legal terminology throughout.

5. *Job.* In many respects the book of Job presents itself as an extended lawsuit between Job and God.[5] Job knows that a mortal cannot contend with God: he cannot be just *(ṣdq)* before God. If God were to contend *(rîḇ)* with him, he could not answer (9:2-3). He asks, nevertheless: "Why do you contend against me *(terîḇēnî)*?" (10:2). He reproaches his friends: "Will you plead God's case and show partiality *(nś' pānîm)* toward him?" (13:8). He continues: "I know that I am in the right *(ṣdq)*; who is there that will contend *(rîḇ)* with me to silence me?" (vv. 18-19). He is convinced that his judge would not contend with him with mighty power, but rather give heed to him (23:6). Elihu reproaches Job: "Why do you contend *(rîḇ)* with God, because he has not answered you?" (33:13; note the use of *ṣdq* in v. 12). Finally, God asks: "Shall a faultfinder contend with Shaddai?" (40:2). In short, *rîḇ* is concerned with determining who is *ṣaddîq,* who will be vindicated.

The same notion lies behind Jeremiah's dispute with God: "You will be in the right *(ṣaddîq)* if I lay charges *(rîḇ)* against you; nevertheless, I must speak with you of *mišpāṭ*" (Jer. 12:1). When plots against Jeremiah's life are disclosed, he commits his cause to God (11:20), i.e., submits it to God's decision. Similar language appears in

5. See Many.

20:12, where Jeremiah declares his confidence that he will see God's retribution upon his enemies.

In Deutero-Isaiah Israel is rebuked for remonstrating with its Maker, denying God's power (Isa. 45:9). The Servant of Yahweh challenges his adversaries: "Who will contend with me *(mî-yārîḇ 'ittî*]? Let us stand up *('md)* together. Who is my adversary *(mî-ba'al mišpāṭî*]?" (50:8). He knows that God will vindicate *(ṣdq* hiphil) him.

6. *Prophetic Lawsuit.* Of particular significance is the so-called prophetic judgment discourse, called *rîḇ*. The texts in question are Isa. 3:13-15; Mic. 6:1-8; Hos. 2:4ff.(2ff.); Jer. 2:4-9; and possibly Isa. 41:21-24. We should also include Isa. 1:16-20, although the word *rîḇ* does not appear.

Isa. 3:13-15 begins with the statement that Yahweh rises *(niṣṣāḇ)* to argue his case *(rîḇ);* he stands *('ōmēḏ)* to judge *(špṭ)* the peoples (*'ammîm;* LXX "his people"). There follows the indictment of the leaders of the people, who have despoiled and crushed the poor. Mic. 6:1-8 begins with a summons to *rîḇ,* with the mountains and hills as witnesses. "Yahweh has a *rîḇ* with his people" (v. 2). Hos. 2:4ff.(2ff.) begins with a call to the Israelites to bring charges against *(rîḇ)* their mother, "for she is not my wife, and I am not her husband." There follows a long indictment charging unfaithfulness. Jer. 2:4-9 begins with an accusatory question, "What wrong did your ancestors find in me?" and charges the people with turning their backs on their benefactor. Not until the end do we find the word *rîḇ:* "Therefore I accuse you, and will accuse your children's children." In Isa. 41:21-24 the idols are challenged to set forth their case *(qārᵉḇû rîḇᵉḵem)* and demonstrate that they can foretell the future — which of course they are unable to do. Isa. 1:16-20 uses instead the summons "Come, let us take it to court *(niwwāḵᵉḥâ*]" (v. 18). The listeners are called on to cleanse themselves and do good; their sins can be forgiven, but if they refuse, the sword will devour them.

That here the prophetic message is clothed in legal terminology is clear and unambiguous. Opinions differ, however, concerning the origin and setting of this genre. Gunkel located its origin in litigation at the city gate, i.e., in the sphere of secular law, the language of which was later worked out in detail by Boecker.[6] Würthwein observed that certain psalms associate forensic language with the notion of God as judge and therefore sought the origin of the genre in the cult. Huffmon and Mendenhall, by contrast, found its background in the covenant notion with its roots in Hittite vassal treaties. Citing documents dealing with broken treaties, Harvey found an association of these with the accusation of the prophetic lawsuit. Nielsen, again, looks for a cultic origin, especially in the New Year's Festival with renewal of the covenant, where God appears as judge to destroy the forces of evil.[7] Finally, Daniels believes that the prophetic lawsuit is not a distinct genre.

The solution of the problem probably lies in a combination of these theories. A cultic

---

6. H. Gunkel, *SAT* II/2², lxiii, lxviii; Boecker.

7. See also G. André, *Determining the Destiny. CBOT* 16 (1980), 237, 239, with an extended concept of *rîḇ*.

tribunal is hardly conceivable apart from secular legal proceedings. The forensic language must have its roots in secular law. Such language may well have been incorporated into the cult, undergoing transformation in the process. Forensic motifs do in fact appear in psalms that celebrate Yahweh's kingship, but it is noteworthy that the word *rîḇ* does not occur in this context. It does appear, however, in Deutero-Isaiah, which exhibits marked similarities to the psalms in question. The psalms that refer to the covenant and the Decalogue (Ps. 50 and 81) and are therefore called psalms of the covenant festival contain no clear echoes of the judgment discourses, unless we count the hiphil of the verb *'ûd* (50:7; 81:9[8]) and veiled accusations as such. It all depends on whether we are dealing with an enthronement festival or a covenant festival, and — if we opt for the latter — how old the notion of the covenant is.[8] It is also noteworthy that in the prophetic lawsuit the indictment predominates,[9] and Yahweh appears more as plaintiff than judge.

III. 1. *LXX.* As one would expect, the LXX does not use a uniform translation for *rîḇ*. For the verb the predominant translations are *krínein* (24 times, plus once in Sirach and *krísis* 3 times), *máchesthai* (10, plus 2 in Sirach and 2 of *máchē*), *dikázein* (8), and *loidoreín* (6). For the noun we find *krísis* (25 times), *díkē* (7), *antilogía* (8), *máchē* (6, plus 2 in Sirach), and *loidoría* (2, plus 4 in Sirach). In Ex. 17:7 the LXX translates *m^eriḇâ* with *loidórēsis.*

2. *Sirach.* In Sirach we find the standard warning against strife and contention (e.g., Sir. 8:1; 11:9). The texts stand solidly in the tradition of wisdom literature.

3. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* In the Dead Sea Scrolls *ryb* occurs 9 times as a verb and 23 times as a noun; it is uncertain whether 4Q512 frs. 24-25, 2 uses the verb or the noun. The combination of *rîḇ* and *mišpāṭ* is common; the two describe the work of God in CD 1:2 and the work of the *m^eḇaqqēr* in 14:12. The members of the community have joined together for *rîḇ* and *mišpāṭ,* i.e., to establish common justice (1QS 5:6). No one can prevail in God's *rîḇ* and *mišpāṭ* (1QH 9:14-15). In 1QH 10:34-35 we read of the speaker's terror in the face of God's judgment on the Gentiles and God's trial of the holy ones. In 1QM 12:5 we even find *rîḇ mišpāṭeḵâ* (cf. 1QSa 1:20). The age at which one may conduct a trial *(lārîḇ rîḇ)* and reach a verdict is set at thirty (1QSa 1:13).

The poet of the *Hodayoth* has become a man of strife (1QH 2:14; 5:22,25 — probably alluding to Jer. 15:10). The *Hodayoth* also speak of the *ba'^alê rîḇ* and *'anšê milḥāmâ* of the poet, i.e., his adversaries (7:23). He knows, however, that God defends his cause (*tārîḇ rîḇî,* 9:23). Whoever enters the community obligates himself to refrain from dispute with "the men of the pit" (1QS 10:19).

Especially interesting is the statement that in the human heart contend *(rîḇ)* two spirits, the spirit of truth *('^emeṯ)* and the spirit of wickedness *('āwel)* (1QS 4:23). Their mutual relationship is marked by zealous contention (*qin'aṯ rîḇ,* 4:17-18).

---

8. → ברית *b^erîṯ*.
9. De Roche.

In the scrolls we find the only instance of a hithpael form of the verb: members of the community are not to reprove (*ykḥ* hiphil) the wicked or take them to court (1QS 9:16).

Ringgren

רֵיחַ *rêaḥ* → **רוח** *rwḥ*

ריק *ryq;* **רֵק** *rēq;* **רֵיקָם** *rêqām*

I. Philology: 1. Etymology; 2. OT; 3. LXX. II. Secular Usage: 1. Literal Usage; 2. Figurative Usage. III. Religious Usage. IV. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Philology.

1. *Etymology.* This Hebrew word group has its parallels in other Semitic languages: Akk. *riāqu/râqu,* "be empty"; *rīqu,* "empty, unladen, idle"; *rīqussu* (from the abstract noun *rīqūtu,* "emptiness"), "empty-handed";[1] Arab. *ryq,* "empty"; *rāqa,* "pour forth"; Aram. and Syr. *rêqāʾ, rêqān,* "empty, stupid," aphel "empty out"; Middle Heb. poel, "empty out"; *rêqānû,* "emptiness, vanity"; etc.

2. *OT.* The Hebrew material is best associated with the root *ryq,* although the semantic similarity to *rqq,* "thin" (cf. Gen. 41:27, which conjoins *raqqôṯ* and *rēqôṯ,* both represented by the consonants *rqwt*), suggests the consonants *rq* as the original semantic vehicle.[2] The form *rēq* can be explained as a contraction of **rayiq;*[3] the uniformly defective spelling of the singular (in contrast to the plural, where we find both *rēqîm* and the plene spelling *rêqîm*) appears to associate the word with the Old Canaanite linguistic stratum.[4] In contrast to *mlʾ,* "be full," no neutral verb stem (qal) developed from this *qaṭil* adjective, although we do find a causative hiphil meaning "empty out" as well as the nominalized inf. *rîq,*[5] which expresses the notion of "for

ryq. S. Ben-Barak, "*rêqîm ûpōḥᵃzîm,*" *EMiqr* VII, 367-68; B. Couroyer, "Note sur II Sam., I 22 et Is., LV, 10-11," *RB* 88 (1981) 505-14; A. B. Ehrlich, *Mikra ki-Pheschuto,* II (1900; repr. Jerusalem, 1969), esp. 199; H. Kronasser, *Handbuch der Semasiologie* (²1968), esp. 144-46; A. Oepke, "κενός," *TDNT,* III, 659-60; J. Pedersen, *ILC,* I-II, esp. 520; III-IV, esp. 34; E. Struck, *Bedeutungslehre* (²1954), esp. 129-33; N. van Wijk, "Zur Etymologie einiger Wörter für 'leer,'" *Indo-germanische Forschungen* 35 (1915), esp. 268.

1. *AHw,* II, 979, 987-88.
2. G. J. Botterweck, *Die Triliterismus im Semitischen. BBB* 3 (1952), 9-30.
3. *NSS,* §10b.
4. *BLe,* §17j,k; 61c‴.
5. *BLe,* §61q.

nothing, in vain." The form *rêqām* functions adverbially with the meaning "fruitlessly, with empty hands." The adverbial function of this form is confirmed by the word *riqami,* which occurs as a gloss in the Amarna Letters, as well as by the use of enclitic *-m* in Ugaritic.[6]

Derivatives of the root *ryq* occur 61 times in the OT, but the possible confusion of *r* and *d* makes the text suspect in a few cases. In Gen. 14:14 the Sam. text reads *wydq* instead of *wyrq,* probably meaning "and he mustered (his trained men)" (an Aramaism). It has been suggested that the verb reflects Akk. *diqū,* "levy (troops)." In Jer. 48:12 the LXX appears to have read *ydyqw,* "shatter," instead of *yryqw,* "empty." In 2 S. 22:43 *'dqm* contradicts *'ryqm* in the parallel text Ps. 18:43(Eng. 42). The word *twrq* in Cant. 1:3 is difficult to interpret.[7]

3. *LXX.* The concept "empty" is represented in Greek by the word *kenós,* which the LXX uses to translate the words derived from the root *ryq;* in Gen. 41:27, however, the "empty" ears are described as *leptós,* "threshed out, hulled." Since the Greek word has undergone a semantic development similar to that of the Hebrew word, the lexical equation could be maintained even where the Hebrew word is used figuratively, e.g., *diá kenḗs, eis kenón* for *lārîq,* "in vain" (Lev. 26:16,20). In some cases, however, we find *mátaios,* "worthless, useless" (Isa. 29:8; Prov. 12:11), *mataiótēs* (Ps. 4:3[2]), *mataíōs* (Ps. 73:13), or the like. The repeated warnings against *rēqîm* also use *mátaia* (Prov. 12:11) and *scholḗ,* "idleness."[8] Those described as *rēqîm* are called *kenoí* (Jgs. 9:4; 11:3), but also *loimoí,* "pernicious" (2 Ch. 13:7).

II. Secular Usage.

1. *Literal Usage.* As used originally, the members of the word family *ryq* denote the circumstance that a container shows no trace of its usual contents, thus proving to be "empty."

A cistern with no water is *rēq* (Gen. 37:24). Jars containing nothing are *rêqîm* (Jgs. 7:16), as are vessels that are bought back from dried-up cisterns (Jer. 14:3). A pot set on the fire without food inside is *rēqâ* (Ezk. 24:11). "Empty" vessels are brought to be filled with oil (2 K. 4:3-6). An "emptied" vessel (lit. "vessel of emptiness") is discarded (Jer. 51:34). The ears blighted by the east wind are *rēqôt,* "yielding no grain" (Gen. 41:27).

The forms of the causative hiphil similarly describe various ways of "emptying." To inspect their contents, full sacks are "emptied" (Gen. 42:35); wine is "poured" from vessel to vessel to remove the dregs (Jer. 48:11); if this does not work, the vessels are "drained" (v. 12).

The language of Cant. 1:3 is difficult. Whether it likens the lover or his name to

6. Contra the view expressed by Brockelmann, *VG,* I, 474; *BLe,* §65y.
7. See II.1 below.
8. See II.2 below.

"emptied" (i.e., "decanted, purified") anointing oil cannot be decided with certainty.[9] Keel suggests the perfume released by anointing oil when it is "poured out."[10]

In a dream the prophet has a vision of two olive-tree branches that "empty" (i.e., "pour") golden oil through two golden pipes into a lamp (Zec. 4:12). When the clouds have been filled with rain (the correct reading, following the accent marks), "they empty (it)" upon the earth (Eccl. 11:3). Yahweh opens the windows of heaven and "pours down" blessings (Mal. 3:10). The language here reflects the notion of "emptying" rain from the storage chambers of heaven.

If we seek to interpret the MT of Gen. 14:14 instead of emending it,[11] the military levy is described as "emptying" the trained men, i.e., "calling them up" from their homes. Medieval Jewish exegetes cite the idiom discussed in the next paragraphs, taking it to mean "arm."

A common idiom speaks of "emptying" a sword after or against someone *(hērîq ḥereḇ 'aḥ^a^rê/ʿal)* pursued in battle. This elliptical expression is easily completed: a warrior empties (his sheath, draws) his sword. The enemy greedy for spoil (the Egyptians pursuing the Israelites) cries out: "I will draw [lit. 'empty'] my sword" (Ex. 15:9). Yahweh will send terrible nations to attack the prince of Tyre; they "shall draw their swords against its beauty and splendor" (Ezk. 28:7). The terrible nation of Babylonia is summoned: "they shall 'empty' their swords against Egypt, and fill the land with the slain" (Ezk. 30:11; the bloodcurdling wordplay "empty"/"fill" appears also in Ex. 15:9). If Israel is disobedient, Yahweh threatens divine punishment: "I will unsheathe the sword against you" (Lev. 26:33). Passages in Ezekiel employ the same language and idea (Ezk. 5:2,12; 12:14).

When Yahweh is the subject of the clause, no suffix is added to *ḥereḇ:* Yahweh draws *a* sword, not *his* sword — which probably means that the actual attack is mounted by enemy nations, albeit at divine behest. We note this usage without attaching too great significance to it, for the notion that weapons of war can be associated with Yahweh by means of a pronominal suffix is clear from Ezk. 12:13: "*my* net . . . *my* snare."

The expression "draw the sword" can be generalized with reference to other weapons. The psalmist beseeches Yahweh: "Draw [lit. 'empty'] the spear and javelin against my pursuers" (Ps. 35:3). Speaking of the implacable conqueror, the prophet asks: "Is he then to keep on emptying his net" (Hab. 1:17), in which he has trapped people like fish (vv. 14-15)? Here too the "emptying" has been interpreted as "drawing" or even "casting" the net;[12] but it may refer instead to the emptying of a net full of fish. Nowhere else, however, is *hērîq* used with *ḥerem,* "net"; it is reasonable, therefore, to emend *ḥermô,* "his net," to *ḥarbô,* "his sword" (with 1QpHab 6:8).

2. *Figurative Usage.* In Hebrew, as in other languages, the concept of "emptiness" can be transferred from the sensory realm to other areas, increasingly removed from

9. H. Ringgren, *Das Hohelied. ATD* XVI/2 (^{3}1981), 257.

10. O. Keel, *ZBK.AT* 18 (1986), 52.

11. But see *BHS.*

12. Rashi.

the domain of physical objects. The meaning "utter poverty" marks one end of the scale, "vanity, futility" the other. This semantic development probably begins with imagery in which the perceptual aspect still dominates.

The plundered city of Jerusalem is likened to an "empty vessel" cast aside by the king of Babylon after he has devoured its contents (Jer. 51:34). The "empty ears" in the pharaoh's dream suggest the coming years of famine (Gen. 41:27). A hungry person who dreams of eating wakes up still hungry, with an empty *nep̱eš* (Isa. 29:8); a malicious person refuses drink to the thirsty and leaves the hungry *nep̱eš* empty (Isa. 32:6). Here the word *nep̱eš* is ambiguous:[13] it may refer to the physiological organ used in eating, "throat, gullet," which is still literally "empty"; more likely, however, *nep̱eš* here refers to a craving that has not been satisfied.

Jacob accuses his father-in-law of wanting to send him away "empty," i.e., without the wages due him (Gen. 31:42). The children of Israel are to ask for precious jewelry and clothing, so that they do not have to depart from slavery "empty-handed" (Ex. 3:21). Boaz fills six measures of barley for Ruth so that she does not have to return to her mother-in-law "empty-handed" (Ruth 3:17). Dtn law requires that a Hebrew slave being released at the end of seven years of servitude not be sent away "empty," destitute, but be given generous provisions (Dt. 15:13-14). The man of violence behaves in stark contrast to this principle, holding on to all the land for himself: he sends widows away "empty" (Job 22:9). As the context shows, this verse refers to the expulsion from their land of those left defenseless (not just turning them away "empty-handed,"[14] without alms).

Nehemiah solemnly curses every hard-hearted creditor who refuse to comply with the remission of debts he has decreed: may God shake such a person from house and property like a garment shaken out: "Thus may they be, shaken out and *rēq*" (Neh. 5:13). Here "empty" means "totally impoverished."

The word also conveys this sense of impoverishment when the plural is used to describe a band of mercenaries like those who followed Abimelech, "*rêqîm* and reckless fellows" (Jgs. 9:4), with whose help he pursued a bloody path to the throne. A similar gang of *rêqîm,* outcasts without any expectations, collected around Jephthah and went raiding with him (Jgs. 11:3). In these contexts, the word does not refer to temperament or attitude but denotes a social status (cf. 1 S. 22:2; 25:10).[15] These people are rebellious have-nots, comparable to the *ḫapiru,* rallying around a leader.[16] The Chronicler places a similar accusation against Jeroboam, the founder of the northern kingdom, in the mouth of the king of Judah: he plotted his insurrection with the aid of certain "*rēqîm* and *bᵉnê bᵉlîyaʿal*" (2 Ch. 13:7). In this later text the word may possibly convey a morally pejorative sense; but it is equally possible that this usage preserves the historical memory that often rebellions against the royal house were carried out with the support of social outcasts.

---

13. → IX, 505-6.
14. D. Steuernagel, *HSAT,* II⁴, 358; cf. NRSV.
15. Contra *GesB,* 759: "feckless."
16. Ben-Barak.

Saul's daughter Michal accuses David of having exposed himself while dancing, like one of the *rēqîm,* one of the rabble (2 S. 6:20). In two variants, wisdom texts are aware that someone who tills the land will have plenty of bread, whereas someone who follows *rêqîm* will reap poverty (Prov. 28:19), having no sense (12:11). Here too the word *rêqîm* might be understood as referring to down-at-the-heels vagrants ("empty" people), whose company should be avoided;[17] but the opposite of productive farming would suggest instead "empty" things, namely idle pursuits or "empty," wasted hours (Vg. *otium;* LXX *mátaia* [12:11] or *scholḗ* [28:19]).

Just as fullness is associated with pleasant notions of material prosperity and, more generally, joy and happiness, so emptiness denotes not only scarcity but also worry and psychological loss. Naomi complains that she went away "full," with a husband and children, and is now returning to her homeland *rêqām,* bereft of her loved ones (Ruth 1:21). Like a vessel returning empty from the cistern (Jer. 14:3), anything that has to return without achieving its purpose is "empty." Here the word takes on the meaning "unsuccessful": Saul's sword never returns *rêqām,* without having slain the enemy (2 S. 1:22); a successful warrior never returns empty-handed (or: none of his arrows returns without having found its mark) (Jer. 50:9). Here we still see traces of the original image of the arrow that drinks the blood of the slain and the sword that devours their flesh (Dt. 32:42; Jer. 46:10).

Finally, however, the word loses all contact with the image of perceptible emptiness and takes on the abstract sense of "in vain." The brief rest at night that a person allows himself to recover from the troubles and anxieties of the day is *lārîq,* it fails of its purpose: he wakes in terror from his nightmares (Sir. 40:6). The ostrich leaves its eggs in the sand to hatch, without any fear that its labor might be "in vain" (*lᵉrîq,* Job 39:16). Peoples build towns "only to feed the flames," and their labor is "for *rîq*" (Hab. 2:13): all their work, devoured by sheets of flame, has been in vain. But those who can enjoy the fruit of their labor have not labored in vain.[18]

The observation that something has proved to be empty is often accompanied by the bitter sense that an appearance to the contrary was deliberately feigned in order to deceive. Hence *rēq* comes to mean "deceptive, deceitful." The persecuted psalmist accuses his enemies of loving *rîq* and seeking after "lies" (*kāzāḇ,* Ps. 4:3[2]). Here *rîq* is tantamount to "malicious slander." Thus the word becomes a term of moral and religious value judgment.

In Ps. 7:5(4) and 25:3 *rêqām* occurs in texts that are difficult to interpret and may reflect textual problems. In any case it means "for nothing, for no reason." The former text represents an oath of innocence; the psalmist swears — according to the accentuation of the MT — that he never plundered anyone who was his enemy for no reason.[19] Ps. 25:3 either speaks of those who are "wantonly" treacherous or (with textual emendation) says that the treacherous will go away "empty-handed."[20]

---

17. Ibn Ezra on 28:19.
18. See III below.
19. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1988), 166, 171.
20. *Ibid.,* 317, 320.

III. Religious Usage. It is God who bestows material abundance; those who enjoy God's favor will not be allowed to go away "empty-handed" (Gen. 31:42; Ex. 3:21). God opens the windows of heaven and "empties" a blessing on the children of Jacob (Mal. 3:10): abundant rain will fructify the land.

Above all, however, it is in God's hands whether human actions bear fruit or end up empty. If the Israelites are obedient, they will enjoy prosperity and fertility (Lev. 26:3-13); otherwise they will discover that they have sowed their seed *lārîq,* "in vain"; their enemies will eat it (v. 16). The heavens and the earth will remain sealed to the disobedient, until their strength is spent *lārîq,* to no purpose (v. 20). Contrariwise, God promises to those who have remained faithful servants that they shall not labor in vain (*lārîq,* Isa. 65:23): they shall build houses and inhabit them themselves, plant vineyards and enjoy their fruit themselves (v. 21).

Here, of course, we find the germ of a frustrated works-righteousness: "For nothing *(rîq)* I have kept my heart clean and washed my hands in innocence," complains the psalmist (Ps. 73:13[12]); it did not prevent terrible affliction (v. 14[13]). As a result of its political collapse, Israel, the servant of Yahweh, felt that it had labored "in vain" and spent its strength "for nothing and vanity" (Isa. 49:4). The devout speaker nevertheless trusts in God, confident in being kept safe (Ps. 73:23-28; Isa. 49:6).

The wicked tyrant builds a town by bloodshed, but Yahweh sees to it that the people labor in vain and "for nothing" (*bᵉḏê-rîq,* Hab. 2:13). Hostile kings and princes plot against Yahweh, who rules the world, and his anointed, the king of Judah; but their sullen conspiracy is *rîq* (Ps. 2:1-2): they cannot succeed. The efforts of Judah to guarantee security through a political alliance are in vain: the help expected from Egypt is "worthless and empty" (Isa. 30:7).

The vain efforts of human activity stand in contrast to the power of God, which never proves empty: the word of Yahweh that goes forth from his mouth never returns *rêqām,* without successfully accomplishing Yahweh's will (Isa. 55:11). It is vital to observe and obey the commandments of Deuteronomy, which has achieved canonical status: life hangs in the balance, it is no trifling matter (*dāḇār rēq,* Dt. 32:47).

IV. Dead Sea Scrolls. The Dead Sea Scrolls use the word in quoting Hab. 2:12-13 (1QpHab 10:8); the same text also uses it independently: *ʿmlm lryq,* "vain efforts" (l. 12), identified with *(ʿbwdt) šww,* "useless labor." The expression "empty the net" in Hab. 1:17 is replaced by the variant "destroy *(yʾbdw)* by the sword" in 1QpHab 6:8.[21] Elsewhere the word is a term of moral and ethical opprobrium: unclean and twisted thoughts should be banished from the heart, from the lips words that are *rêqîm,* "vain, lewd" (1QS 10:24), that the tongue may serve the ends of holiness. On the holy sabbath, stupid and "idle" *(rēq)* chatter is prohibited (CD 10:17-18).

Kedar-Kopfstein

21. See II.1 above.

רָכַב rāḵaḇ; רֶכֶב reḵeḇ; רַכָּב rakkāḇ; מֶרְכָּבָה merkāḇâ

I. Etymology and Meaning. II. Occurrences. III. Usage: 1. Qal; 2. Hiphil; 3. *reḵeḇ;* 4. *merkāḇâ;* 5. *merkāḇ;* 6. *rōḵēḇ, rakkāḇ.* IV. 1. LXX; 2. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Etymology and Meaning. The root *rkb* is found in all Semitic languages, always with the meaning "mount, ride." This sense has a vertical connotation, whereas in Akkadian the verb *rakābu* suggests instead horizontal movement with the aid of a vehicle. Akkadian also uses the verb in sexual contexts, where it means "cover" (of animals) or "pollinate" (of plants); in omen texts, finally, it denotes that which "lies above."[1] Ugaritic uses *rkb* in parallel with *'lh,* "climb (a tower, atop a wall)."[2] The root is also comparable to → ישב *yāšaḇ* in the sense of "sit (on something)" (cf. Lev. 15:9-10 with v. 4; 2 S. 18:9; Jer. 17:25; 22:4; Zec. 1:8; 9:9).

In the hiphil the verb refers clearly to a horizontal movement in the sense of "transport" in three passages (2 K. 9:28; 23:30; 1 Ch. 13:7). This meaning of the verb in the hiphil may have assimilated to that of other verbs with similar meaning;[3] note also the synonymy of *nāśā'* and *rāḵaḇ* in Gen. 31:17; 42:26; Job 6:2; 30:22; 31:36. But 2 S. 6:3 makes the semantic difference clear: the ark is "loaded" *(hirkîḇ)* onto the cart and then "transported" *(nāśā').* In the later parallel 1 Ch. 13:7, *rāḵaḇ* has taken on the meaning of *nāśā'.*

Arad ostracon 1:5-9 reads: *wm'wd hqmḥ hr'šn trkb* 1 [?] *qmḥ l'śt lhm lḥm.* Sasson's suggestion that *trkb qmḥ* means "grind grain" (cf. *reḵeḇ* in the sense of "upper millstone" in, e.g., Dt. 24:6)[4] is not persuasive. The context requires that *trkb* have a meaning similar to "load, transport" (2 K. 9:28; 23:30; 1 Ch. 13:7).[5]

---

rāḵaḇ. D. R. Ap-Thomas, "All the King's Horses," in *Proclamation and Presence. FS G. H. Davies* (1970; repr. Macon, 1983), 135-51; W. B. Barrick, "Elisha and the Magic Bow," *VT* 35 (1985) 355-63; *idem,* "The Meaning and Usage of *RKB* in Biblical Hebrew," *JBL* 101 (1982) 481-503; S. P. Brock, "Νεφεληγερέτα = *rkb 'rp,*" *VT* 18 (1968) 395-97; K. J. Cathcart, "*Trkb qmḥ* in the Arad Ostracon and Biblical Hebrew *rekeb* 'Upper Millstone,'" *VT* 19 (1969) 121-23; R. Ficker, "רכב *rkb* reiten, fahren," *THAT,* II, 777-81; R. de Langhe, "De betekenis van het Hebreewse Werkword *RKB,*" *Handelingen van het VIIIe Vlaamse Filologencongres* (1949), 89-96; M. A. Littauer and J. H. Crouwel, *Wheeled Vehicles and Ridden Animals in the Ancient Near East. HO* 7.1.2/1 (1979); W. L. Moran, "Some Remarks on the Song of Moses," *Bibl* 43 (1962) 317-27, esp. 323-27; S. Mowinckel, "Drive and/or Ride in the OT," *VT* 20 (1970) 239-42; A. Salonen, *Die Landfahrzeuge des alten Mesopotamien* (1951); *idem,* "Notes on the Stem *r-k-b* in Akkadian," *ArOr* 17 (1949) 313-22; V. Sasson, "The Word *trkb* in the Arad Ostracon," *VT* 30 (1980) 44-52; M. Weinfeld, "'Rider of the Clouds' and 'Gatherer of the Clouds,'" *JANES* 5 (1973) 421-26.
→ סוס *sûs;* → פרשׁ *pārāš.*

1. Salonen.
2. *KTU,* 1.14, II, 20-21; IV, 2-3; cf. 2 K. 10:15ff.
3. Moran, 325.
4. Similarly Cathcart, and W. F. Albright in *ANET*[3], 569 n. 30.
5. See Otzen; Y. Aharoni, *Arad Inscriptions* (Jerusalem, 1975), 13-14; A. Lemaire, *Inscriptions hébräiques. LAPO* 9-10 (1977), 1.158; D. Pardee, *UF* 10 (1978) 291, 295-96.

Only once (2 K. 13:16) is *rāḵaḇ* found in conjunction with archery, meaning "handle (a bow)" in some way. This is frequent in Aramaic,[6] where Cowley thinks in terms of horizontal movement ("Do not shoot your arrow at the righteous"),[7] but the verb may as well refer to fitting an arrow to the bowstring, or aiming at the enemy.[8] These meanings do not really suit the context of 2 K. 13:16, which is better explained in terms of a two-man bow-stringing operation such as is documented in an Ashurbanipal relief.[9]

II. Occurrences. The verb *rāḵaḇ* occurs 57 times in the qal and 20 times in the hiphil. The noun *reḵeḇ,* "war chariot," occurs 116 times, *merkāḇâ,* "(war) chariot," 44 times. The nouns *merkāḇ,* "chariot, saddle," and *rakkāḇ,* "driver," occur 3 times each. The nouns *riḵbâ,* "(act of) riding," and *r^eḵûḇ,* "vehicle," occur once each.

III. Usage.

1. *Qal.* Riding usually occurs in narrative contexts with no particular theological significance. Several animals are named as mounts: camel (→ גמל *gāmāl,* Gen. 24:61; 1 S. 30:17); (young male) donkey (*ʿayir,* Jgs. 10:4; 12:14; Zec. 9:9); she-donkey (*ʾāṯôn,* Nu. 22:22,30 [Balaam]; Jgs. 5:10; 2 S. 19:27[Eng. 26] [Mephibosheth]; 2 K. 4:24 [the Shunammite woman]; → חמור *ḥ^amôr,* 1 S. 25:20,42 [Abigail]; 2 S. 16:2; 1 K. 13:13 [a prophet from Bethel]; Zec. 9:9); mule (*pereḏ,* 2 S. 13:29 [David's sons]; 18:9 [Absalom]); horse (→ סוס *sûs,* Gen. 49:17 [a rider falls from a horse]; Ex. 15:1,21 [horse and rider]; 2 K. 18:23 = Isa. 36:8 [Hezekiah will be given horses if he can find riders for them]; Isa. 30:16 ["we will ride upon swift steeds"]; Jer. 6:23 [the foe from the north; similarly 50:42]; Hos. 14:4[3] ["we will not ride upon horses"]; Hag. 2:22 [horses and riders fall]; Zec. 1:8 [a man on a red horse]; 12:4 [panicked horses, maddened riders]; Job 39:18 [the ostrich laughs at horse and rider]; Est. 6:8 [Haman on the king's horse]; 8:10,14 [mounted couriers]). Only once (Neh. 2:12) do we find *b^ehēmâ,* emphasizing the inconspicuous circumstances. In three of the passages cited, a woman is the subject: Gen. 24:61; 2 K. 4:24; 1 S. 25:20,42. To the texts that speak of riding horses we may add several that use the phrase *rōḵēḇ sûs:* 2 K. 9:18-19; Ps. 76:7(6); Jer. 51:21; Ezk. 23:6,12,23; 38:15; Am. 2:15; Zec. 10:5.

In several instances *rkb* has the extended meaning "drive" (a chariot, usually a war chariot). In three Jeremiah texts *sûs* and *reḵeḇ* are combined: 17:25; 22:4 *(reḵeḇ* and *sûsîm);* 51:21 (horse and rider, chariot and charioteer). Hag. 2:22 speaks of *merkāḇâ* and *sûs.* In two passages it is unclear whether the verb means "ride" or "drive." In 2 K. 9:16 we read of Jehu's departure: *wayyirkaḇ wayyēleḵ;* it is not clear whether he mounted his horse or his chariot. According to 1 K. 18:45, Ahab mounted *(yirkaḇ)* his chariot and went *(hlk)* to Jezreel (LXX here reads *wayyēḇk*). Also unclear are the words addressed to the king in Ps. 45:5(4): *r^eḵaḇ ʿal-d^eḇar-ʾ^emeṯ w^eʿanwâ-ṣeḏeq.* The

6. Cf. Ahiqar 126,128,191: *ʾl thrkb ḥṭk lṣdyq.*

7. *AP,* 224.

8. For the former see EnEl, IV, 35-36; for the latter, G. R. Driver, *JTS* 25 (1924) 302.

9. See Barrick, "Elisha."

NRSV may well convey the correct meaning: "Ride on victoriously for the cause of truth and to defend the right."

The verb appears frequently in symbolic contexts. Solomon's riding on a mule (1 K. 1:32-40) should not be interpreted simply as an expression of the traditional association of this animal with royalty (cf. Zec. 9:9, which alludes to the saying concerning Judah in Gen. 49:11).[10] It was natural for David's sons to ride on mules (2 S. 13:29; 16:2; 18:9); these animals may even have been preferred by the Davidic dynasty (cf. Gen. 49:11; Zec. 9:9).[11] What 1 K. 1 emphasizes is that Solomon rode upon the mount of his father (vv. 33,38). In this manner David proclaims his support for Solomon's claim to the throne.

Est. 6 describes a similar symbolic act. A person honored by the king is given royal robes and a crown and is allowed to mount the king's horse and be acclaimed by heralds (vv. 3,11); this scene is depicted in the murals of the synagogue at Dura Europos.[12] Contrary to the conventional interpretation, the narrative does not suggest horizontal movement in the sense of "riding";[13] in the symbolism of the account, mounting to a seat upon the king's horse is equivalent to putting on the garments that the king himself wears (v. 8). On the symbolic implications of investiture, see also Nu. 20:25-28; Isa. 22:20-25; Zec. 3:3ff. At Ugarit the ritual refusal of royal robes signifies abdication.[14]

A similar investiture is recorded in the Joseph story: Pharaoh gives Joseph a ring, a diadem, and special garments. In addition, he allows Joseph to mount his second chariot (Gen. 41:42-43). Presentation of such a chariot, chiefly to signal the new status of the recipient, was a common practice in Egypt.[15] There is nothing in the text to suggest Joseph's riding a ritual circuit.

This "mounting" is thus an act of sovereignty comparable to the par. *yāšab* (cf. Jgs. 5:10; 10:4; 12:14; 2 S. 16:2) in the sense of "sit (on the throne)" = "be king" (cf. Ex. 11:5; Lam. 4:12).[16] The metaphorical significance does not reside in the act of "sitting" but rather in sitting on a regal object sat upon so that the "sitting" turns into a royal enthronement (cf. Jer. 17:25).

Of theological interest are the texts where God is the subject of *rākab,* always in a theophanic context. God rides upon the heavens (Dt. 33:26) or the heavens of the primal age (*qedem,* Ps. 68:34[33]).[17] In Isa. 19:1 Yahweh rides upon the clouds (*'āb;* cf. Dt. 33:26: *šᵉḥāqîm).* In Ps. 18:11(10) (par. 2 S. 22:11) he flies mounted on a → כרוב *kᵉrûb*. In Ps. 68:5(4) we find the divine epithet *rōkēb bāʿᵃrābôt,* which at first glance

10. For Ugarit see *KTU,* 1.19, II, 3-10; for Mesopotamia see E. Lipiński, *VT* 20 (1970) 51.

11. P. D. Hanson, *JBL* 92 (1973) 43ff.

12. C. du Mesnil du Buisson, *Les peintures de la synagogue de Doura-Europos. Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici* 83 (1939), 116-17 and pl. LII.1.

13. So LXX and Josephus, *Ant.* 11.6.10.

14. RS 17.159, 22-31 (*PRU* IV [1956], 126).

15. Barrick, "Meaning," 490 n. 56.

16. N. K. Gottwald, *Tribes of Yahweh* (Maryknoll, 1979), 512-30. For Mari see J. R. Kupper, *ARM* 6 (1954), 108-9.

17. For a more nuanced understanding of both passages see Barrick, "Meaning," 496-98.

appears to mean "who rides through the deserts";[18] since, however, the expression *rkb 'rpt,* "cloud-rider,"[19] is an epithet of Baal in the Ugaritic texts, most scholars now assume that here too Yahweh is called "cloud-rider." The meaning "desert," however, is not alien to the context, and so we may be dealing with a reinterpretation of the Canaanite epithet.

Imitating Baal, who "mounts the clouds,"[20] Yahweh is now "the one who has mounted, who is in the cloud." If the clouds are to be understood as a vehicle in this verse, then the language is directly comparable to the expression *yôšēb hakkᵉrûbîm* (cf. also vv. 34-35[33-34], where Yahweh is described as *rôkēb bišᵉmê-qedem*[21]). The conceptual parallel *yôšēb baššāmayim* appears in Ps. 2:4; 123:1.

Depictions of the storm god riding on the clouds are well known.[22] The Babylonian deity Adad is called *rākib ûmi,* "rider upon the storm."[23]

Hab. 3:3-15 describes Yahweh as a warrior standing in his war chariot (v. 8); before him go fear and terror (cf. Jer. 6:22-23).

2. *Hiphil.* The hiphil forms usually mean "cause to mount" or "cause to ride." Moses puts his wife and sons on a donkey (Ex. 4:20), David has Solomon placed on a mule (1 K. 1:33,38,44), Haman mounts Mordecai on a horse that the king has ridden (Est. 6:9,11). Speaking metaphorically, Job says that God has made him ride the storm to destroy him (Job 30:22). It is often a mark of special honor to let someone ride in one's own chariot: thus Pharaoh honors Joseph (Gen. 41:43) and Jehu honors Jehonadab (2 K. 10:16). David has the ark loaded on a cart (*rkb* hiphil, 2 S. 6:3; 1 Ch. 13:7). According to Dt. 32:13, God mounts Israel upon the heights; the same expression appears in Isa. 58:14 as a promise. The fallen kings Ahaziah and Josiah are placed in chariots and brought to Jerusalem (2 K. 9:28; 23:30). In Hos. 10:11b *hirkîb* means "harness," a sense derived from the placing of a yoke or similar apparatus on the neck of a draught animal (cf. v. 11aβ). Ps. 66:12 describes the suffering of Israel in Egypt: "You have placed people over our heads *(lᵉrō'š)*" — in triumph or as a means of oppression? The text is not entirely clear.[24]

3. *rekeb.* The noun *rekeb* usually refers collectively to war chariots or to a company of chariots. It often appears in combination with *pārāšîm,* "cavalry" (1 S. 13:5; 1 K. 1:5; 9:19; 10:26), or *sûsîm* (2 K. 10:2; cf. 7:14), or with *sûs* and *pārāš* together (Ex. 14:9,23). Several passages emphasize that the Canaanites had iron chariots (Josh. 17:16; Jgs. 1:19; cf. 4:3,7,13). We also read that the Philistines (1 S. 13:5), Egyptians

18. J. Vlaardingerbroek, *Psalm 68* (diss., Amsterdam, 1973), 15-19, 247.

19. Or "Charioteer of the Clouds," with N. Wyatt, *UF* 24 (1992) 420-22.

20. P. J. van Zijl, *Baal. AOAT* 10 (1972), 33.

21. Moran, 325.

22. A. Vanel, *L'iconographie du dieu de l'orage dans le Proche-Orient ancien. CahRB* 3 (1965); H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1989), 54.

23. K. L. Tallqvist, *Akkadische Götterepitheta. StOr* 7 (1938), 175; See also Weinfeld, 422-25.

24. See Barrick, "Meaning," 500.

(Ex. 14:6-7), Arameans (2 S. 8:4), and Assyrians (2 K. 19:23 par. Isa. 37:24) employed chariots.[25] Solomon's garrison cities where he stationed chariots are mentioned in 1 K. 9:19; 10:26. The same context speaks of commanders of the chariotry (*śārê reḵeḇ,* 9:22; cf. 22:32). Ezk. 23:24 uses the combination *reḵeḇ wᵉgalgal,* "chariots and wheels," in describing the punishment of Oholibah. In 1 S. 8:12 we find the expression *kᵉlê reḵeḇ,* "chariot equipment."

Ps. 68:18(17) speaks of the innumerable chariots in God's passage from Sinai into the temple. Joseph, too, had a great number of chariots when he journeyed to Shechem to bury his father (Gen. 50:9); they are mentioned alongside *pārāšîm,* but the text says nothing about the nature and appearance of these chariots. Seeing chariots *(reḵeḇ),* horsemen in pairs *(ṣemeḏ pārāšîm),* and trains *(reḵeḇ)* of donkeys and camels, the prophetic lookout in Isa. 21:7 is to listen very diligently. Here *reḵeḇ* has an extended meaning.

The usual word for a single chariot is *merkāḇâ;* only rarely do we find *reḵeḇ.* According to 1 K. 22:35, Ahab died propped up in his chariot; later, when the chariot was washed, the dogs licked his blood. In each case the word used is *reḵeḇ.* According to 2 Ch. 35:24, the dead Josiah was taken from his war chariot *(merkāḇâ)* and laid in his "second chariot" *(reḵeḇ mišneh).* Elijah is taken up into heaven in a *reḵeḇ 'ēš* (2 K. 2:11). The passage is unclear, since, according to the text, the *reḵeḇ 'ēš* serves primarily to separate Elijah from Elisha, whereupon Elijah is lifted into the heavens in a whirlwind *(sᵉʿārâ* [v. 11]; in v. 16 it is the *rûaḥ yhwh).* Therefore Elisha's exclamation in v. 12, "Father, father! The chariots of Israel and its [their] drivers!" refers not to this chariot but to the hosts of heaven. At an early date, however, these words were reinterpreted as referring to Elijah: he is like an army to Israel. In 2 K. 13:14, then, the words (understood in this sense) are applied to Elisha.

The plural of *reḵeḇ* appears in Cant. 1:9, where the beloved is compared to "a mare among Pharaoh's chariots," an image suggesting the acme of physical perfection.

Finally, *reḵeḇ* denotes the upper of a pair of millstones (Dt. 24:6; Jgs. 9:53; 2 S. 11:21).

4. *merkāḇâ.* The noun *merkāḇâ* means "chariot" (cf. Akk. *narkabtu,* Ugar. *mrkbt*[26]), usually a war chariot. Narrative texts mention the chariots of the Egyptians (Ex. 14:25; 15:4; 1 K. 10:29 par. 2 Ch. 1:17 [chariots imported from Egypt]), Canaanites (Josh. 11:6,9; Jgs. 4:15; 5:28), Cushites (2 Ch. 14:8), and Israelites (1 K. 12:18 par. 2 Ch. 10:18; 1 K. 20:33; 22:35 par. 2 Ch. 35:24 [synonymous with *reḵeḇ*]; 2 Ch. 9:25 [Solomon's chariot cities]; 18:34 [the parallel in 1 K. 22:35 uses *reḵeḇ*]; 35:24).[27]

But *merkāḇâ* occurs also in prophetic texts. Isa. 2:7 criticizes the multitudes of horses and chariots in Israel as a sign of political presumption that goes hand in hand with idolatry. Mic. 5:9(10) threatens that Yahweh will destroy the horses and chariots

25. See III.4 below.
26. Salonen, *Landfahrzeuge;* M. Civil, *JAOS* 88 (1968) 3-14.
27. See III.3 above.

in Israel (cf. also Hag. 2:22). Jer. 4:13 describes the attack of the enemy chariots, which are like a whirlwind, and horses, which are swifter than eagles. Isa. 66:15 uses the same imagery to describe Yahweh's chariot. Mic. 1:13 upbraids the inhabitants of Lachish for harnessing their steeds to their chariots, preparing (in vain) for battle. Nah. 3:2 describes the rumbling wheels, galloping horses, and bounding chariots of an attack on Nineveh. In his eighth vision Zechariah sees four chariots with horses of different colors, symbolizing the four winds of heaven (Zec. 6:1-3). Finally, Hab. 3:8 speaks of Yahweh's victorious attack with horses and chariots.

But chariots also appear in more peaceful contexts. Joseph is permitted to ride in Pharaoh's "second chariot" (Gen. 41:43). According to Samuel, one of the prerogatives of a king is to have young men run before his chariot (1 S. 8:11). Absalom got himself a chariot and horses (2 S. 15:1). Shebna's splendid chariots *(markᵉḇôṯ kāḇôḏ)* will be carried off to a distant land (Isa. 22:18). The chariots of Joseph (Gen. 46:29), Naaman (2 K. 5:21,26), and Jehonadab (2 K. 10:15) are probably ordinary vehicles, not war chariots. Ahaziah flees in a chariot (2 K. 9:27). According to 2 K. 23:11, Josiah burned "the chariots of the sun" (*markᵉḇôṯ haššemeš;* LXX reads sg.) with fire. This expression probably refers to a processional chariot for Shamash, since the context also mentions "the horses dedicated to the sun." In Mesopotamia Shamash has a chariot driver *(rākib narkabti).*[28]

Ps. 104:3 says that Yahweh makes the clouds his chariot *(rᵉḵûḇ).* His coming on the wings of the wind (→ רוּחַ *rûaḥ*) introduces the image of the cherubim supporting his throne and recalls the expression *yōšēḇ hakkᵉruḇîm* (1 S. 4:4; 2 S. 6:2; 2 K. 19:15; Ps. 80:2[1]; 90:1; etc.) and the chariot throne of the cherubim (1 Ch. 28:18; cf. Dnl. 7:9; Sir. 49:8).[29] Cloud chariot and cherubim throne coalesced in this late theology, finally becoming fixtures of the cult.

5. *merkāḇ.* The noun *merkāḇ* (Lev. 15:9; Cant. 3:10) is a generic term for an object on which someone can sit.

6. *rōḵēḇ, rakkāḇ.* The noun *rakkāḇ* denotes a charioteer (1 K. 22:34; 2 K. 9:17-18; 2 Ch. 18:33). Used as a noun, the ptcp. *rōḵēḇ* denotes a "rider."[30]

The parallelism *rōḵᵉḇê ʾᵃṯōnôṯ ṣᵉḥōrôṯ* par. *yōšᵉḇê ʿal-middîn* in Jgs. 5:10 is difficult. Boling translates *middîn* as "judgment seat," but that interpretation does not fit the context.[31] The parallelism suggests rather that the word means "saddle blanket" for a donkey (cf. Heb. and Ugar. *md[d]*, "garment"). In this case v. 10 refers to the aristocracy, contrasted with those who "walk by the way."

---

28. Tallqvist, *Götterepitheta,* 455: "chariot attendant"; cf. H. Gressmann, *ZAW* 42 (1924) 323.
29. On the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice in the Dead Sea Scrolls, see IV.2 below; on Ezk. 1:10, see W. B. Barrick, *CBQ* 44 (1982) 543-50.
30. See above.
31. R. G. Boling, *Judges. AB* VI A (1975), 110.

IV. 1. *LXX.* The LXX usually uses *epibaínein* to translate the qal of *rkb;* for the participle it often uses *anabátēs* or *epibátēs.* For the hiphil it uses *anabibázein, epibibázein,* or *epikathízein.* For *reḵeḇ* we find *hárma* or *epimýlion;* for *merkāḇâ, hárma* or (rarely) *hippasía.*

2. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* Most of the occurrences of *rkb* in the Dead Sea Scrolls are in the War Scroll, in the sections that detail how the army is drawn up and how it achieves victory. After describing the formation of the cavalry *(pārāšîm),* the text speaks of 1,400 chariots *(rkb)* for the men of the array of the lines (1QM 6:10-11). On them are to ride *(rkb)* men hardened in battle and trained in driving/riding (*mlwmdy rkb,* 6:13). When they have achieved victory, the chariotry/cavalry *(rkb)* are to pursue the enemy to destruction (9:6-7). The *'anšê reḵeḇ* are also mentioned in 8:4. The noun *merkāḇâ* appears only in 11:10, in the context of a reference to the destruction of Pharaoh's chariots. The laws governing war in the Temple Scroll use the expression *rkb wsws* (58:7) or *sws wrkb* (61:13) with the same meaning as in the Hebrew OT.[32]

In 4Q491 frs. 1-3, 3 *rkb wlpr(šym)* stand in parallel as "horses and riders." The context of 4Q509 fr. 241, 1 is fragmentary and therefore unverifiable.

The 10 occurrences of *merkāḇâ* in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice coupled with the peculiar nature of these Songs has led some scholars to associate them with the "*merkāḇâ* literature." These texts, dating from the late Hasmonean to the Herodian period (ca. 60 B.C.E.–50 C.E.), mention the *merkāḇâ* once in the central Song for the Seventh Sabbath (4Q403 fr. 1, 2:15): the furnishings of the innermost portion of the sanctuary (the chariot of its *d^eḇîr,* the cherubim, and the wheels [orders of angels?]) lead the singing of God's praises. In the Song for the Eleventh Sabbath (4Q405 fr. 20, 2; frs. 21-22, 3-5), the *merkāḇâ* motif appears repeatedly: this text describes the ministrations of the consecrated priesthood in the holy of holies, with the *merkāḇâ* and the other furnishings again presented as singing God's praise. In the Song of the Twelfth Sabbath, in line with a tendency toward decreasing mystical intensity, we find the *merkāḇâ* blessed by the angels (4Q405 fr. 20, 1; frs. 21-22, 8,11-12). These Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice stand traditio-historically intermediate between the account of Ezekiel's vision of the chariot throne (Ezk. 1; 10) and Heikalot literature.[33]

Barrick/Ringgren

---

32. See III.3 above.

33. C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice. HSS* 27 (1985); G. G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (New York, ²1965); I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums* 14 (1980); and, finally, the publications of D. J. Halperin.

רְכוּשׁ $r^e\underline{k}\hat{u}\check{s}$; רָכַשׁ $r\bar{a}\underline{k}a\check{s}$

I. Mesopotamia. II. OT: 1. Occurrences and Constructions; 2. P; 3. Other Pentateuch Texts; 4. Chronicler's History; 5. Daniel. III. LXX.

I. Mesopotamia. A phrase in the Annals of Ashurbanipal (Prism A, IX.36) is usually cited as a possible equivalent to *r*$r^e\underline{k}\hat{u}\check{s}$ outside the OT: *gamallê*^{meš} *ru-ku-ši-šu-nu,* "camels, their property."[1] This Akkadian word *rukūšu* has often been called a West Semitic loanword.[2] This explanation is questionable, however, since the word is a hapax legomenon; there are no other West Semitic occurrences. Furthermore, this text would date from half a century *before* the OT occurrences that can be dated with any assurance. This supposed Akkadian parallel to $r^e\underline{k}\hat{u}\check{s}$ must therefore be viewed with skepticism. Possibly we must reject it altogether, if[3] we accept the reading *gamallê*^{meš} *ru-ku-pi!-šú-nu,* "camels, their mounts." In this case we would be dealing not with the unique *rukūšu* but with the well-attested noun *rukūbu.*

II. OT.

1. *Occurrences and Constructions.* The noun $r^e\underline{k}\hat{u}\check{s}$ and the verb $r\bar{a}\underline{k}a\check{s}$ belong to the late phase of OT Hebrew, appearing at the earliest in texts of the exilic period. The first occurrences that can be dated with some assurance are found in P. In fact, the verb appears only in P, occurring three times in a relative clause in *figura etymologica* with the noun $r^e\underline{k}\hat{u}\check{s}$ (Gen. 12:5; 31:18; 46:6). Once it appears in association with a series of related nouns, esp. *qinyān* (Gen. 36:6). The noun $r^e\underline{k}\hat{u}\check{s}$ appears in P (Gen. 12:5; 13:6; 31:18; 36:7; 46:6), as well as in other Pentateuch passages, probably none of which antedates P (Gen. 14:11,12,16[twice],21; 15:14; Nu. 16:32; 35:3). It is common in the Chronicler's History (1 Ch. 27:31; 28:1; 2 Ch. 20:25; 21:14,17; 31:3; 32:29; 35:7; Ezr. 1:4,6; 8:21; 10:8). The latest occurrences are probably those in Dnl. 11:13,24,28. All the occurrences in the Chronicler's History and Daniel, and almost all in P (except Gen. 31:18), are written plene; all the occurrences in Gen. 14 are written defectively.

The noun $r^e\underline{k}\hat{u}\check{s}$ denotes "goods" or "possessions" in general. The context may make the nature of the possessions more specific. In the majority of cases, $r^e\underline{k}\hat{u}\check{s}$ appears to denote movable goods that can be packed up and taken away. Some passages (e.g., Gen. 12:5) indicate clearly that $r^e\underline{k}\hat{u}\check{s}$ does not include human property (slaves). Elsewhere $r^e\underline{k}\hat{u}\check{s}$ is obviously a comprehensive term for all of a person's possessions (esp. those of a king), including real property. Our word is apparently a relatively indefinite expression, which could be used flexibly according to the requirements of different contexts.

---

1. M. Streck, *VAB* 7/2 (1916), 74-75; cf. *VAB* 7/3, 571.
2. For references see W. Muss-Arnolt, *Assyrisch-englisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch* (1905), 966; *GesB,* 761; *HAL,* III, 1236.
3. With *AHw,* II, 994.

The verb *rkš* appears only in relative clauses modifying the noun *rᵉḵûš* (or *qinyān*). The translation "gather" is at the very least an unfortunate rendering.[4] The construction refers to property that has been "acquired" or "procured" (cf. LXX *ktásthai, peripoieísthai*), with the nature of the acquisition remaining totally unspecified.

2. *P.* The verb *rkš* (found only in P) and the noun *rᵉḵûš* are among the stylistic features of P^G, although their occurrences are limited to Genesis. They appear in stereotyped contexts. One group of texts describes a situation of departure: Gen. 12:5; 31:18aβb (where the first relative clause with *rkš* can hardly belong to the original text); 36:6 (with *qinyān* and *rkš*). Here it is clear that *rᵉḵûš* is a portion of personal property acquired *(rkš)* in the past and now taken on the journey. Each text specifies where the property was acquired and where the journey is to end (emending the text of 36:6).

A second group of texts (Gen. 13:6; 36:7) ascribes the separation of Abram from Lot and Esau from Jacob to the size of their *rᵉḵûš,* probably referring primarily to their livestock (cf. *miqneh* in 36:7).

3. *Other Pentateuch Texts.* We find *rᵉḵûš* five times in Gen. 14. The verses in question are all structurally related. V. 11 records that Chedorlaomer and his royal allies took *(lqḥ)* the *rᵉḵûš* of Sodom and Gomorrah, i.e., the movable property and provisions of the cities' inhabitants, and went their way. Using almost exactly the same words, v. 12 relates the same event to Lot and his goods. While v. 11 probably represents the conclusion of an earlier account of the war, in which Abram and Lot did not appear, v. 12, echoing the wording of v. 11, brings Lot on the scene so as to motivate Abram's intervention, which is the subject of the account in vv. 13-17 and 21-24. According to v. 16, Abram, having routed the enemy, brings back the *rᵉḵûš* of the cities (although the rest of the narrative speaks only of Sodom) together with Lot's *rᵉḵûš;* thus he has recaptured all the booty taken by the enemy. Going beyond what was said in vv. 11-12, v. 16 presupposes that the inhabitants of the cities *(nāšîm, ʿam)* were also carried off and recaptured by Abram. This element of the narrative is intended to lay the groundwork for the episode in vv. 21-24, where the king of Sodom asks only for the return of the captured people *(nepeš),* relinquishing their property *(rᵉḵûš),* an offer that Abram generously declines.

In its present form, Gen. 14 is a late text. Even if — as is almost certain — the passage incorporates earlier traditions, the present language and narrative framework date from the postexilic period. The formulaic use of *rᵉḵûš* is meant to echo the usage of P, though it remains unique.

In Gen. 15:13-14 God predicts to Abram the future sojourn of his offspring in Egypt and their oppression there, but also their departure with great possessions (*rᵉḵûš gāḏôl,* v. 14). This passage clearly alludes to the tradition that is also recorded in Ex. 3:21-22; 11:2-3; 12:35-36. If vv. 14-15 are assigned to E, as most scholars have assumed until

---

4. *GesB,* 761; *KBL²,* 893.

recently, then Gen. 15:14 would be the earliest occurrence of *r^e^ḵûš*.[5] This analysis, however, has been called into question.[6] More likely vv. 13-14 are a secondary addition, closer to P than to E;[7] it is unlikely that this text antedates the P^G occurrences.

Despite the difficulty of dating precisely the two remaining occurrences in the Pentateuch, the same verdict is probable. Nu. 16:32 records that the earth swallowed up the followers of Korah and their goods. Now v. 32b is clearly a secondary addition: it reverts to Korah from the theme of the Dathan-Abiram tradition, which the narrative had been following. It probably dates from the redactional stage when the chapter was being assembled from J and P texts.

Nu. 35 deals with the establishment of cities for the Levites and cities of refuge. V. 3 requires the pasturelands of the former to be available for the cattle, the *r^e^ḵûš*, and "all the animals" of the Levites. This passage beautifully illustrates the imprecise usage of the word *r^e^ḵûš*. Here it can refer only to a subgroup of domestic animals; the three terms *(b^e^hēmâ, r^e^ḵûš, kol-ḥayyâ)*, however, do not denote clearly defined species of animals, but obviously are meant to comprehend the livestock in its totality. Nu. 35 is a late text, probably belonging "to the redactional unification of Pentateuchal narrative and deuteronomistic historical work."[8]

4. *Chronicler's History.* The Chronicler's History uses *r^e^ḵûš* in a variety of contexts, almost all of which were formulated by the Chronicler rather than being taken from a source. The only exceptions are 1 Ch. 27:31 and 28:1, which mention the *śārê hār^e^ḵûš*, stewards of the crown property. The former verse appears in the "great interpolation" of the Chronicler's History (23:2–27:34); the latter undoubtedly owes its origin to a redactional bracketing with 27:31b, which concludes the list of officials in vv. 15-31. This text is the first to speak of crown property; it must be using *r^e^ḵûš* in the most comprehensive sense, including fields and their produce, domestic plants and animals, and probably precious metals and jewelry in the treasury as well. Even if the list belongs to the preexilic period, it can hardly date from the reign of David, but most likely from the late period of the monarchy, possibly the time of Josiah.[9] But the concluding v. 31, which shifts the list to the Davidic era, can hardly antedate the exilic period.

Other texts in the Chronicler's History use *r^e^ḵûš* to refer to crown property: 2 Ch. 21:14,17; 31:3; 32:29; 35:7. In 21:12-15 the Chronicler cites a supposed letter from Elijah to Jehoram, king of Judah, foretelling a disaster to be visited by Yahweh upon the latter's sons and wives and all his possessions (v. 14). The fulfillment of the prediction is recounted in v. 17. In contrast to Jehoram, kings Hezekiah and Josiah are accorded high praise for reforming the cult and supporting its worship through contributions from the their own possessions. In 2 Ch. 31:3 we read that Hezekiah provided

---

5. But see the reservations of O. Procksch, *Genesis. KAT* I^2,3^ (1924), 294, 297.
6. See already M. Noth, *ÜPt*, 38.
7. J. Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs* (Berlin, ^4^1963), 21-22.
8. M. Noth, *Numbers. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1968), 253.
9. K. Galling, *Chronik. ATD* XII (1954), 76.

sacrificial animals for the regular cult after his reform, and in 35:7 (cf. 30:24) that Josiah provided lambs, kids, and bulls for the Passover sacrifice. In 32:27ff. the Chronicler provides an inventory of Hezekiah's possessions (v. 29).

In 2 Ch. 20:25 we find *rᵉḵûš* alongside "livestock," "clothing" (text emended), and "precious things" in the description of the booty *(šālāl)* taken by Jehoshaphat and his people after their "battle" with the Moabites, Ammonites, and Meunites. Once again, the vagueness of *rᵉḵûš* ("belongings") stands out amid the concrete vocabulary of the context.

The Chronicler's version of Cyrus's edict orders the local population to aid with silver, gold, animals, and *rᵉḵûš* those desiring to return to Jerusalem (Ezr. 1:4; carried out: 1:6). The concrete meaning of *rᵉḵûš* (provisions? containers?) is left unclear. In 8:21, by contrast, the word refers clearly to all the movable goods that the people returning with Ezra took with them. It may have an even more inclusive sense in the sanctions threatened in 10:8: the "forfeit of all property" probably includes the houses of the intransigent who refused to come to Jerusalem, if it does not in fact refer to a kind of cultic expropriation of all their property, including real estate.

5. *Daniel.* In the book of Daniel *rᵉḵûš* occurs only in ch. 11, a historical retrospect of the Persian, Alexandrian, Ptolemaic, and Seleucid periods in the form of a vision. Here *rᵉḵûš* always appears in military contexts. In v. 13 it refers to what Antiochus III takes along with his army *(ḥayil)* in his campaign against Ptolemy V, probably "supplies." V. 24 describes the attempt of Antiochus IV to increase his influence in Jerusalem by rewarding his partisans with plunder taken in his military forays. Here *rᵉḵûš* stands in the company of terms for "plunder" and can hardly mean anything else. In v. 28, finally, *rᵉḵûš* means the plunder taken and brought back by Antiochus in his campaign against Ptolemy VI.

III. LXX. While the LXX translators used *ktásthai* and *peripoieísthai* equally to translate the few occurrences of the verb *rkš,* they varied considerably in their translation of the noun *rᵉḵûš.* The most common equivalents are *tá hypárchonta* or *hýparxis* (11 times in all) and *aposkeuḗ* (9 times). Some variations probably reflect idiosyncracies of the different translators. For example, the translation *chrḗma* is limited to Daniel, and *ktḗnos* to Numbers. Especially noteworthy is the paraphrase *hḗ híppos* in Gen. 14:11,16,21.

Thiel

רָכַךְ rākak; רַךְ rak; רֹךְ rōk; מֹרֶךְ mōrek

I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences. II. Usage. III. 1. LXX; 2. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. 1. *Etymology.* The root *rkk* has supposedly been identified in three Ugaritic texts. In one, however, the reading *rkm* is uncertain; in the second the correct reading is *tkm,* not *rkm;* and in the third the correct reading is not *yrk ql bph,* "soft was the lowing in his mouth," but *yrk t'l b(tk),* with the interpretation of *yrk* obscure.[1] Thus *rkk* has no clear parallel in Ugaritic.

In Aramaic, *rkk* is widely distributed.[2] In Imperial Aramaic, *rkyk,* "soft," appears in the maxim: "The speech/tongue of the king is soft when he rewards."[3] Sarai's beauty is described in the words: "and how delicate *(m'r[k])* is the bloom of her face" (1QapGen 20:4). In an epistle of Rabbi Gamaliel II decreeing a leap year, the word *rkykyn* serves to describe the natural realm, which is lagging far behind the calendar — especially the lambs, which are still too delicate.[4] There are also parallels in Jewish Aramaic, such as *rikkûk,* "soft, easily chewed food."[5] In Mandaic we find the verb *rkk,* "be delicate," and the adj. *rakik,* "delicate."[6] Copt. *lôk,* "be delicate, soft, fresh," is also related etymologically.[7] Arab. *rakka* means "be thin and fine." There is a modern South Arabic parallel in Mehri *ruk* (= *rukk*), "be frightened, afraid."[8] The much-discussed word *rhaká* in Mt. 5:22 (often derived from *rêqa'*) may also be associated with *rkk.* The term of abuse *rhaká* might refer to a *malakós,* "sissy," and, as 1 Cor. 6:9 shows, a male prostitute.[9]

2. *Occurrences.* The verb *rkk* occurs 6 times in the qal, once each in the pual (Isa. 1:6) and hiphil (Job 23:16). We also find only one occurrence each of the nouns *rōk,* "delicacy" (Dt. 28:56), and *mōrek,* "faintheartedness" (Lev. 26:36). The adj. *rak* occurs 16 times in the OT. In total, then, there are 26 occurrences of the root *rkk* in its various derivatives, widely distributed in Genesis, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, 2 Samuel, 2 Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Psalms, Jonah, Proverbs, and 1-2 Chronicles. The meaning runs from "be delicate, soft, pampered, weak" to "be fainthearted."

II. Usage. A tender young twig or shoot from the topmost branches of a tree can be described as *rak* (Ezk. 17:22). To provide for guests, a host slaughters a calf that is ten-

---

1. See, respectively, *KTU,* 1.13, 29; 4.27, 1; 1.10, III, 27.
2. *LexSyr,* 730.
3. Ahiqar 100, 105.
4. Beyer, 359-60.
5. *WTM,* s.v.
6. *MdD,* 420, 435.
7. W. Westendorf, *Koptisches Handwörterbuch* (Heidelberg, 1977), 76; but cf. W. Vycichl, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue copte* (Louvain, 1983), 96.
8. W. W. Müller, *Mélanges linguistiques offerts à Maxime Rodinson* (Paris, 1985), 275.
9. Y. Arbeitman, *Maledicta* 4 (1980), 80.

der and good, i.e., free of blemish (Gen. 18:7). Children that are still young and frail need protection (Gen. 33:13; cf. Prov. 4:3). Twice Chronicles emphasizes that Solomon was still young and inexperienced (*na'ar wārāḵ,* 1 Ch. 22:5; 29:1). When Gen. 29:17 describes Leah's eyes as *rakkôṯ,* the text is clearly pointing out a blemish in the matriarch's beauty: "weak" (RSV; cf. NRSV "lovely") eyes were considered highly unattractive (contrast Cant. 1:15; 4:1,9; 6:5; 7:5[Eng. 4]).

In combination with *lēḇ* or *lēḇāḇ,*[10] *rkk* usually characterizes the heart as weak, faint, fearful, anxious. For example, Job laments that God has made his heart faint, discouraged (*hēraḵ,* Job 23:16). Warriors facing battle are exhorted not to lose courage (*'al-yēraḵ l^eḇaḇḵem,* "do not let your heart be fearful," Dt. 20:3). In the context of a holy war, this formula is used in parallel with the *'al-tîrā'* formula in Isa. 7:4 and Jer. 51:46. Anyone who is afraid or disheartened is unfit for battle (Dt. 20:8). In Lev. 26:36 Yahweh threatens to send faintness, fear *(mōreḵ)* into the hearts of those who survive. The Chronicler attempts to exonerate Rehoboam by pointing out that he was still young and therefore irresolute *(na'ar w^eraḵ-lēḇāḇ),* so that he could not withstand Jeroboam (2 Ch. 13:7; cf. also 2 S. 3:39, where the MT has David describe himself as powerless, whereas the LXX may have read *rēa'* instead of *rak*). It is not so much fear as obedience to Yahweh that 2 K. 22:19 par. 2 Ch. 34:27 has in mind when it says that Josiah's heart was moved *(raḵ)* by the recitation of the newly discovered book of the law, so that he humbled himself (*kn'* niphal) before Yahweh.

We also find *rkk* used in connection with the spoken word. For example, Job 40:27(41:3) uses *rakkôṯ* in parallel with *taḥ^anûnîm* in a rhetorical question: "Will it [the hippopotamus] make many supplications to you or speak soft words to you?" The words of the psalmist's enemy in Ps. 55:22(21) are "softer than oil," but are nevertheless drawn swords. Prov. 15:1 teaches that a soft answer turns away wrath, and Prov. 25:15 shows that a soft tongue (cf. Ahiqar 105) can accomplish much.

In the curses of Dt. 28:15-68, one particular detail toward the end (vv. 53-57) is described at length: hunger will force the besieged populace to eat their own children. The text singles out the most spoiled and pampered man *(hā'îš hāraḵ b^eḵā w^ehe'ānōg)* and woman, the woman so spoiled and pampered that she does not venture to set the sole of her foot on the ground, being accustomed to riding in a carriage or being carried on a palanquin. The loathsome behavior of the decadent upper class is totally subject to Yahweh's curse.

III. 1. *LXX.* The LXX translates *raḵ* seven times with *apalós, rōḵ* with *apalótēs* (Dt. 28:56), and *rāḵaḵ* twice with *apalýnein* (2 K. 22:19; Ps. 55:22[21]). We find *malakós* used twice for *raḵ* (Job LXX 40:27; Prov. 25:15) and *malakýnein* once for the hiphil of *rāḵaḵ* (Job 23:16). Twice the interpretive translation *deilós* is used for *raḵ* (Dt. 20:8; 2 Ch. 13:7) and once *deilía* for *mōreḵ* (Lev. 26:36). Twice the LXX does not translate the word (Ezk. 17:22; Jer. 51:46 [= LXX 28]); elsewhere it translates freely.

10. → VII, 399-437.

2. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* In the Dead Sea Scrolls the verb *rkk* occurs only in 1QM 10:3, in the words *'l yrk lbbkmh,* reflecting Dt. 20:3. The adj. *rk* occurs once (1QM 6:12), in a description of the stallions drawn up for battle: they are to be "fleet of foot, tame of mouth *(rky ph),* and long in wind"; it occurs also in 11QT 62:3, corresponding to Dt. 20:8.

Kellermann

רכל *rkl;* רֹכֵל *rōḵēl;* רָכִיל *rāḵîl;* רְכֻלָּה *r^eḵullâ;* *מַרְכֹּלֶת *markōleṯ*

I. Etymology. II. *rōḵēl.* III. *r^eḵullâ.* IV. *rāḵîl.* V. *markōleṯ.*

I. Etymology. The root *rkl* is a variant of *rgl,* from which it is distinguished by the voiced *g* (cf. Heb. *zkr* and Phoen. *skr*). The total absence of verbal forms of *rkl* in Hebrew apart from the nominalized ptcp. *rōḵēl* might indicate Phoenician or Arabic origin for the derivatives of *rkl.* On the other hand, the root has not yet been found in Ugaritic or Phoenician/Punic texts. In South Arabian, more particularly Minaean, the reflexive form *rtkl* occurs, with the meaning "engage in trade."[1] The basic meaning of the root may appear in Arab. *rakala,* "kick, use the foot,"[2] from which may develop the meanings "move" and "go about."

In Aramaic we find the noun *rkl* with the meaning "trader."[3] Syriac uses the *qaṭṭal* form *rakkālā* to denote a tradesman.

II. *rōḵēl.* The ptcp. *rōḵēl* denotes an itinerant "merchant," originally a wandering peddler. As its substantival translation, the LXX uses *émporos,* "merchant" (Ezk. 27), or *rhopopṓlēs,* "retailer" (Neh. 3:31-32). The LXX thus locates the Hebrew term in both retail and wholesale commerce. The earliest occurrence of *rōḵēl* may date from the end of the 7th century, when Nahum (Nah. 3:16) uses it to denote the Assyrian merchants (cf. Akk. *tamkāru*[4]). A Dtr redactor uses the term in 1 K. 10:15: the royal revenue service imposes taxes on the merchants. Ezekiel in particular speaks of the *rōḵēl* (Ezk. 17:4), specifically the *rōḵēl* of Tyre (Ezk. 27:3) or the *rōḵēl* who serves as a commercial intermediary with Tyre (vv. 13,15,17,20,22-24). His function as a go-between may be understood as that of a broker (vv. 13-24) or even a "peddler," a role assigned to the lands that have trade relations with Tyre. The negative connotations associated with

---

rkl. E. Lipiński, "Products and Brokers of Tyre according to Ezekiel 27," in E. Gubel and Lipiński, eds., *Phoenicia and Its Neighbours. Studia Phoenicia* III (Louvain, 1985), 213-20.

1. ContiRossini, 242; Biella, 489.
2. Wehr, 358.
3. *AP,* 38.4; possibly also in the Behistun Inscription, 69 (55).
4. *AHw,* III, 1314-15.

a "peddler" are evident in Neh. 13:20, whereas 3:31-32 envisions the more positive figure of a "shopkeeper." Cant. 3:6 thinks in terms of a dealer in perfumes, a dealer in exotic products.

III. *r^e^ḵullâ.* *The noun r^e^ḵullâ* appears only in Ezk. 26:12 and 28:5,16,18; it means "trade" in the sense of commercial activity or economic enterprise. The LXX translates it with *emporía,* "trade" (28:5,16,18) or *tá hypárchonta,* "the merchandise" (26:12). All these passages associate the term exclusively with Tyre, a fact that might also support its Phoenician origin.

IV. *rāḵîl.* *The noun rāḵîl* is usually translated "slander," but the LXX already makes clear distinctions when it finds in the term nuances of dishonesty (Jer. 6:28), deception (Lev. 19:16; Jer. 9:3[Eng. 4]), duplicity (Ezk. 22:9), and falsity (Prov. 11:13). The Tg. of Jer. 6:28 and 9:3(4) evokes the nuance of deception *(n^e^ḵîlû).* All these terms may hint at a dishonorable background for *rkl* activities. The connotation of "deception" is clearly recognizable in Lev. 19:16 and Jer. 9:3(4). This negative connotation, of course, does not derive directly from the etymology of the word, which would suggest instead some such meaning as "peddling," since a *qaṭîl* noun form normally denotes an action.

In most instances the text uses the idiomatic expression *hālaḵ rāḵîl,* with *rāḵîl* functioning as an inner object (cognate acc.). The semantic development is clear: it begins with "go from door to door" or "peddle" and ends with "swindle" (Lev. 19:16; Jer. 6:28; 9:3[4]; Prov. 11:13; 20:19; cf. also 1QS 7:15-16; 1QH 5:25). The expression *'îš rāḵîl* (11QT 64:7 [sg.]; Ezk. 22:9 [pl.]) originally referred to someone engaged in trade; then it took on the pejorative sense of "swindler." This semantic development is analogous to that of Arab. *makkār* and *makîr:* "supplier, peddler," then "swindler."

Aram. *rāḵîl* in 1QapGen 2:9 might mean "slander," but the fragmentary context leaves some uncertainty. The notion of slander is clearly expressed in the Tg. of Lev. 19:16 and Ezk. 22:9, where the expression *'^a^ḵal qirṣā'/qirṣîn* is borrowed from Akk. *karṣî akālu,* "slander."[5] An analogous interpretation appears in Jer. *Peah* 1.16a, where Lev. 19:16 is explained by *zû r^e^ḵîlûṯ l^e^šôn hāra',* "this is the slanderous babbling of a wicked tongue." This postbiblical Jewish interpretation of the word has established itself in modern translations.

V. *markōleṯ.* *The noun markōleṯ* appears only in Ezk. 27:24, where it may mean "marketplace" or "merchant's table," with the prefix *ma-* indicating place where or instrument whereby the activity of *rkl* is carried out. But *b^e^markulteḵ* should probably be emended (following the apparatus of *BHS,* Tg., and LXX) to *bām r^e^ḵullāṯēḵ,* "therein lies your trade" (cf. NRSV), or "for them they were your traders."[6]

Lipiński

---

5. S. A. Kaufman, *The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic. AS* 19 (1974), 63.
6. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 50, 63-64.

רמה rmh; מִרְמָה mirmâ; רְמִיָּה r^e^mîyâ; תַּרְמִית tarmîṯ

I. 1. Etymology; 2. Distribution. II. 1. Meaning; 2. Syntagms; 3. Lexical Field. III. Theological Usage: 1. Psalms; 2. Wisdom Literature; 3. Prophets. IV. 1. Dead Sea Scrolls; 2. LXX.

I. 1. *Etymology.* The root *rmh* is analogous to Akk. *ramû* III, "become relaxed, loosen"[1] (not etymologically connected with the homonym *ramû* II, "throw"[2]), Arab. *rmy* VI, "become sluggish, slow"; Egyp. *rmy,* "flow"; Aram. and Syr. *r^e^mā',* "throw." It is not clear in all cases whether we are dealing with a single root or several roots.

2. *Distribution.* The OT underlines this uncertainty. Here *rmh* appears 4 times in the qal (Ex. 15:1,21; Jer. 4:29; Ps. 78:9) and 8 times in the piel. The qal is usually assigned to *rmh* I, "throw, shoot," and the piel to *rmh* II, "deceive, betray."[3] Haupt erroneously considered the two roots to be originally identical.[4] The following discussion ignores *rmh* I.

The nouns are derived from *rmh* II: *r^e^mîyâ* (15 times), a *qaṭîl* form that may be interpreted either as an adjective or as a verbal noun;[5] *mirmâ* (40 times), a *miqṭal* form that functions as a verbal noun;[6] and *tarmîṯ* (5 times).

II. 1. *Meaning.* Many OT passages provide information about the connotations of the word group. The following are relevant to the sense of the verb in the piel. According to Gen. 29:25, when Laban gives Jacob Leah instead of Rachel, Jacob asks: *lāmmâ rimmîṯānî,* "Why have you deceived me?" In Josh. 9:22 Joshua accuses the Gibeonites of deception (cf. *'ormâ,* "cunning," v. 4) by pretending to have come from a distant land. In 1 S. 19:17 Michal helps David escape through the window and lays the teraphim[7] on the bed; when Saul discovers the situation, he asks why she has deceived him. Finally, Saul goes in disguise to the medium at Endor, who asks him, "Why are you trying to deceive me?" Mephibosheth confesses to having deceived David, but blames misinformation and slander *(way^e^raggēl)* on the part of his servant (2 S. 19:27-28[Eng. 26-27]). In each case the fact of deception is a given.

The same is true of the use of *mirmâ.* Gen. 27:35 says that Jacob came to Esau

---

rmh. N. Ararat, "*'ormâ* and *mirmâ* in the Narratives of the Book of Genesis," *BethM* 26 (1980/81) 137-47; M. A. Klopfenstein, *Die Lüge nach dem AT* (Zurich, 1964).

1. *AHw,* II, 953-54.
2. *AHw,* II, 952-53.
3. *HP,* 233.
4. P. Haupt, *AJSL* 20 (1903) 167.
5. *BLe,* §61 mα-rα.
6. *BLe,* §61 mε, pζ.
7. → תרפים *t^e^rāpîm.*

*b*ᵉ*mirmâ* and took away his blessing; cf. the answer of Jacob's sons to Shechem *b*ᵉ*mirmâ* (Gen. 34:13). In 2 K. 9:23 Joram calls Jehu's revolution *mirmâ.* Jer. 5:27 compares the extent of *mirmâ* in the houses of Yahweh's people to a snare full of birds; possibly *mirmâ* is used here to suggest the wicked who set traps to catch the unwary (v. 26). In Jer. 9:5(6) the semantic field is vastly extended, making precise interpretation difficult: "You live in the midst of deceit *(b*ᵉ*ṯôḵ mirmâ),* in deceit *(b*ᵉ*mirmâ)* they refuse to know me." The context includes such terms as *m*ᵉ*nā'ᵃpîm,* "adulterers," and *'ᵃṣereṯ bōg*ᵉ*ḏîm,* "a band of traitors" (v. 1[2]); *šeqer,* "falsehood," and *rā'â,* "evil" (v. 2[3]); *'āqaḇ,* "betray," and *rāḵîl hālaḵ,* "slanderer" (v. 3[4]); and *tll* hiphil, "deceive" (v. 4[5]).

In Hos. 12:1(11:12) *kaḥaš* ("lies") and *mirmâ* against the prophet stand in parallel with political stupidity resulting from lack of trust in Yahweh. The *diḇrê mirmôṯ* against those who are quiet in the land (Ps. 35:20-21) are probably false accusations of neighbors. Jer. 9:7(8) castigates the Judahites because their tongue is like a deadly arrow and speaks *mirmâ* — i.e., "with their mouth they speak *šālôm* to their neighbors, while inwardly they are planning an ambush." Thus *mirmâ* indicates a discrepancy between words and actual intentions. Finally, the folly of fools *('iwweleṯ k*ᵉ*sîlîm)* leads to *mirmâ* (Prov. 14:8). Deceit in the mouth of a witness, however, can be deadly (12:17; 14:25).

In all these instances *rmh* or *mirmâ* refers to a situation in which reality differs from appearance. Such situations involve interpersonal transactions in which someone acts or speaks consciously and deliberately to conceal or cover up certain facts. The purpose is often "to gain a personal advantage."[8] Injury to one's neighbor can be a result, although this element may not stand in the foreground.[9] Laban brings Leah to Jacob in order to guarantee her marriage, not "to deprive Jacob of the fruits of his first seven years of servitude,"[10] for Jacob does get Leah as his "reward." In most other cases, too, personal advantage is probably the purpose of *mirmâ.* Examination of the semantic field shows that *mirmâ* is a superior term whose semantic extension includes the other terms for "falsehood," etc.

2. *Syntagms.* Syntagmatic analysis of the word group shows immediately that the subject of the verb is always a person. In 1 Ch. 12:17 we also find an indirect object of the action in the form of a noun introduced by *l*ᵉ*.*

In the case of *r*ᵉ*mîyâ,* however, we find that it can be associated with both animate and inanimate nouns: *qešeṯ r*ᵉ*mîyâ,* "a treacherous, defective bow" (Hos. 7:16; Ps. 78:57); *kap̱ r*ᵉ*mîyâ,* "a slack hand" (Prov. 10:4: the hand does not live up to expectations); *nep̱eš r*ᵉ*mîyâ,* "an idle person" (Prov. 19:15); *lāšôn r*ᵉ*mîyâ,* "a deceitful tongue" (Ps. 120:2-3). Human *r*ᵉ*mîyâ* can even pervert the *m*ᵉ*le'ḵeṯ yhwh* (Jer. 48:10). It can be the subject of *hāyâ l*ᵉ (Prov. 12:24) and *ḥāraḵ* (Prov. 12:27), and the object of *dibber* (Job 13:7), *hāḡâ* (Job 27:4), and *'āśâ* (Ps. 52:4[2]; 101:7). It can dwell in the human

8. Klopfenstein, *Lüge,* 311.
9. Contra Klopfenstein.
10. Klopfenstein, *Lüge,* 311.

rûaḥ (Ps. 32:2). Thus we observe that the word can be understood as an adjective or verbal noun equivalent to the verb. Its association with inanimate phenomena may be considered an extension of the usage of the verb.

In the case of *mirmâ,* we observe the following. It appears as subject only in nominal clauses. It can be the object of *dibber* (subj.: *lāšôn,* Jer. 9:7[8]; *śᵉpāṯayim,* Ps. 34:14[13]), *hāgâ* (subj.: enemies, Ps. 38:13[12]), *kwn* hiphil (subj.: *ʿᵃḏaṯ ḥānēp̱,* Job 15:35), *ngd* hiphil (subj.: *ʿēḏ šᵉqārîm,* Prov. 12:17), *šyt* (subj.: *śônēʾ,* Prov. 26:24), *ʿāśâ* (subj.: the wicked king, Dnl. 11:23), and *ṣmd* hiphil (subj.: *lāšôn,* Ps. 50:19). The verb *ḥāšaḇ* can have *diḇrê mirmôṯ* as an object, with *ʾōyᵉḇay/śōnᵉʾay* as subject. The word appears in a variety of syntagms: *mōʾzᵉnê mirmâ,* "false balances" (Hos. 12:8[7]; Am. 8:5; Prov. 11:1; 20:23), *ʾaḇnê mirmâ,* "dishonest weights" (Mic. 6:11), *śip̱ṯê mirmâ,* "deceitful lips" (Ps. 17:1), *diḇrê mirmôṯ* (35:20), *ʾîš-mirmâ* (43:1; 55:24[23]), *lᵉšôn mirmâ* (52:6[4]), *pî mirmâ* (109:2). With *mirmâ* one can come (*bôʾ,* Gen. 27:35), answer (*ʿānâ,* Gen. 34:13), surround God (*sāḇaḇ,* Hos. 12:1[11:12]); one can also dwell in *mirmâ* (*yāšaḇ,* Jer. 9:5[6]). The *mōʾzᵉnê mirmâ* can be used to oppress (*ʿāšaq,* Hos. 12:8[7]); *ʾaḇnê mirmâ* are not tolerated *(zāḵâ)* by Yahweh (Mic. 6:11). We find the following word pairs: *ḥāmās ûmirmâ* (Zeph. 1:9), *ʾîš dāmîm ûmirmâ* (Ps. 5:7[6]; [*ʾanšê* . . .] 55:24[23]), *mirmôṯ wāṯōḵ* (10:7), *tōḵ ûmirmâ* (55:12[11]), *ʾāwen ûmirmâ* (36:4[3]), *ʾîš-mirmâ wᵉʿāwlâ* (43:1), *hawwôṯ ûmirmôṯ* (38:13[12]).

3. *Lexical Field.* The lexical field is rich in related terms (see above). By carefully distinguishing these terms and identifying their relationships, we can define their semantic valence more precisely. The verb/noun → שקר *šāqar/šeqer* can denote false witness, a false oath, idolatry and magic, the speech and activity of false prophets, lying, perverted religious practices, deception in trade and commerce; it can also pronounce a negative verdict on human conduct in general.[11] This term is therefore semantically more inclusive than *rmh.*

The verb *kāzaḇ* means "tell lies," and the noun *kāzāḇ* means "falsehood"; their meaning is clearly delimited.[12] The verb *kāḥaš* can mean "challenge, deny, conceal, keep secret, suppress." It denotes "the distortion or dissimulation, denial or concealment of a state of affairs when one actually knows better."[13] This word thus closely approximates the word family of *rmh;* it is restricted, however, to verbal expression, whereas the *rmh* family can denote both verbal and physical behavior.

The noun → שוא *šāwʾ* means "deceit, falsity, emptiness"; the meaning "harm brought about by magical spells" is accepted by Klopfenstein but is challenged by Sawyer.[14] This term is closely related to the lexical field of *rmh,* but is not completely synonymous. The noun *ʿormâ,* "cunning," can describe the same incident as *rmh.*[15] The

11. M. A. Klopfenstein, *THAT,* II, 1010-19; *idem, Lüge.*
12. Klopfenstein, *THAT,* I, 817-23; *idem, Lüge;* R. Mosis, → VII, 104-21.
13. Klopfenstein, *THAT,* I, 826; cf. *idem, Lüge;* K. D. Schunck, → VII, 132-35.
14. Proposed by S. Mowinckel, *Psalmenstudien,* I (Oslo, 1921, ²1961), 50-57; see Klopfenstein, *Lüge,* 315-20; J. F. A. Sawyer, *THAT,* II, 882-84.
15. See II.1 above.

'āqab family denotes actions, usually malicious attacks. The expression *hālak rākîl* refers to slander. The piel of *rāgal* can describe the same incident as *rmh.*[16] The hiphil of *tll* II means "deceive, mock, trifle with." Finally, *'ārab/'ereb/'ōreb* denote lying in wait, cunning, ambush. We see, then, that this word family has its own distinctive character, while exhibiting a varied and complex relationship to a number of terms.

III. Theological Usage. The three nouns appear in only three theological contexts.

1. *Psalms.* In the Psalms the righteous psalmist does not have deceitful lips (*śiptê mirmâ,* Ps. 17:1) and does not swear deceitfully (*l^emirmâ,* 24:4). "Happy are those to whom Yahweh imputes no iniquity, and in whose spirit there is no *r^emîyâ*" (32:2). In 34:14(13) we find the admonition: "Keep your tongue from evil, and your lips from speaking deceit." Conversely, these terms can be used to describe the wicked: "No one who practices *r^emîyâ* shall remain in my house; no one who utters lies *(šqr)* shall continue in my presence" (101:7; synonymous parallelism). The psalmist prays to be delivered from lying lips and a deceitful tongue (120:2) and asks Yahweh to destroy them (vv. 3-4; cf. also 35:20; 38:13[12]; 43:1). We find *mirmâ* in several catalogs of vices: 5:7(6); 10:7; 36:4(3); 50:19; 52:6(4); 55:12,24(11,23); 109:2 (also in Job 31:5).

Finally, *tarmît* takes on an all-embracing ethical sense when it is used for straying from God's *tôrâ* (Ps. 119:118; the LXX reading *tar'ît,* "their aim," may be preferable here).

2. *Wisdom Literature.* Usage of the root in wisdom literature is similar. According to Job 13:7, it is unthinkable to speak falsehood *('awlâ)* or deceit *(r^emîyâ)* in defense of God. Job will hold to this principle as long as he lives (27:4).

The root plays a particular role in wisdom literature in the contrast between the righteous and the wicked (Prov. 12:5), the clever and the foolish (14:8). It is characteristic of the wicked to conceive "mischief" *('āmāl),* bring forth evil *('āwen),* and raise up "deceit" (*mirmâ,* Job 15:35).

3. *Prophets.* The prophetic usage of these terms is also somewhat stereotyped, as in catalogs of vices: Mic. 6:12 *(r^emîyâ);* Jer. 9:5(6) and Hos. 12:1(11:12) *(mirmâ).* In Am. 8:5 the prophet cites the questions of the tradesmen: "When will the new moon be over so that we may sell grain? And when will the sabbath be past so that we may offer wheat for sale? We will make the ephah small and the shekel great, and practice deceit with false balances *(mō'z^enê mirmâ).*" Mic. 6:11 asks rhetorically: "Can I tolerate wicked scales and a bag of weights of *mirmâ?*" The prophets may be drawing on a wisdom tradition that false balances are an abomination to Yahweh (Prov. 11:1; cf. 20:23). Zeph. 1:9 castigates those who "fill their master's house with violence and fraud." Jer. 23:26 likens the prophets who prophesy *šeqer* to the prophets whose hearts are *tarmît.* In Jer. 14:14, in a similar context, *šeqer, qesem, '^elîl,* and *tarmît* appear as synonyms.

16. See II.1 above.

Jer. 8:5 equates apostasy and *tarmîṯ*. The various terms tend to lose their distinctive meanings, being employed simply to characterize the wicked. Contrariwise, Isa. 53:9 describes the servant of Yahweh: "He had done no *ḥāmās,* and there was no *mirmâ* in his mouth." In Zeph. 3:13 the same language describes the ethical character of the righteous remnant of Israel.

IV. 1. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* The hithpael of the verb appears three times in the Dead Sea Scrolls; the occurrence in 1QH 17:7 may represent *rmh* I; the other two occurrences, in the Manual of Discipline (both in 1QS 7:6), mean "treat negligently" (another member or the property of the community).

The nouns are more frequent (*r^emîyâ,* 17 times; *mirmâ,* 6 times) and usually describe the wicked (1QS 9:8; 1QH 2:16; 4:20; 14:14) and their machinations (1QS 4:9,23; 1QH 2:34; 4:7,10,17; 1QpHab 3:5 [*mirmâ:* the Kittim]; 4QpNah 2:8). They are also found in the regulations of the community (1QS 7:5; 8:22) and in statements concerning human nature (1QH 1:27) and the truthfulness of God (1QH 4:21).

2. *LXX.* The LXX treats the verb uniformly, but exhibits substantially greater flexibility in translating the two nouns. It uses *enedreúein,* "lie in ambush," to translate *rmh* II in Prov. 26:19; everywhere else it uses *paralogízesthai,* "miscalculate, deceive, outwit." For *r^emîyâ* we find 7 instances of *dólos,* "deception"/*dólios,* "deceptive, cunning," as well as once each of *ádikos,* "unjust"; *aergós,* "ineffectual"; *amelṓs,* "reckless"; *ánomos,* "lawless"; *enteínein,* "stretch"; *streblós,* "cunning"; *hyperēphanía,* "arrogance." The translation of *mirmâ* also varies extensively: 20 instances of *dólos,* "deception"; 9 of *dólios,* "cunning"; 3 each of *doliótēs,* "deception," and *adikía,* "injustice"/*adikós,* "unjust"; 2 of *pseúdos,* "falsehood"; and once *asébeia,* "godlessness."

Kartveit

רִמּוֹן *rimmôn*

I. 1. Ancient Near East; 2. Etymology. II. 1. Occurrences and Meaning; 2. Toponyms and Anthroponyms; 3. Deities; 4. Cultic Usage; 5. Song of Songs; 6. Other. III. Versions.

---

rimmôn. J. Börker-Klähn, "Granatapfel. A. Archäologish," *RLA,* III, 616-30; H. Brunner, "Granatapfel," *LexÄg,* II, 891-92; J. Engemann, "Granatapfel," *RAC,* XII, 689-718; H. Frehen, "Granatapfel," *BL*², 642; V. Hehn, *Kulturpflanzen und Haustiere* (Berlin, ⁷1902), esp. 237-44, 591-92; O. Keel, M. Küchler, and C. Uehlinger, *Orte und Landschaften der Bibel,* I (Zurich, 1984), esp. 81; L. Keimer, *Die Gartenpflanzen im Alten Ägypten. Ägyptologische Studien* 1 (1924; repr. Hildesheim, 1967), 47-51, figs. 180ff.; E. Levesque, "Grenadier, grenade," *DB,* III, 337-41; I. Löw, *Die Flora der Juden,* III (Vienna, 1924), esp. 80-113; F. Muthmann, *Der Granatapfel, Symbol des Lebens in der alten Welt* (1982); M. Ohnefalsch and J. Richter, *Kypros, the Bible and Homer* (Eng. trans. London, 1893); W. Röllig, "Granatapfel. B. Nach Texten,"

I. 1. *Ancient Near East.* The pomegranate is the fruit of a shrub or small tree *(Punica granatum)* that can attain a height of some twelve feet; it has leathery lanceolate leaves and produces clusters of scarlet flowers. The fruit, about the size of an apple, has a tough red skin and contains a great number of seeds encapsulated by septa and covered with juicy red pulp.[1] Because of its sweet seeds and juice, the pomegranate was and is highly valued for the preparation of a refreshing beverage. Its skin was used to make a yellow dye and in tanning.[2]

The plant probably originated in Iran or southern Mesopotamia; it was already introduced to Egypt by Thutmose III in the course of his military campaigns.[3] From Elam and Sumer, the shrub spread west through Syria and Palestine to Cyprus (ca. 2500 B.C.E.), Mycenae (ca. 1500-1200), Etruria, and Carthage.[4]

The tree or its fruit is often depicted on monuments, ornaments, pendants, and the like, although the secondary literature does not always clearly distinguish pomegranates from apples, quinces, and poppy heads.[5] The pomegranate also appears frequently in the literary productions of the eastern Mediterranean, Mesopotamia, Iran, Urartu, Greece, and the Aegean.[6] Its symbolic significance has frequently been noted. In the ancient Near East as well as the Greco-Roman world, the pomegranate was a symbol of fertility or an aphrodisiac;[7] it also symbolized life. Not every picture or mention of a pomegranate, however, should be considered symbolic.[8] The pomegranate is occasionally associated with so-called dying-and-rising deities.[9]

2. *Etymology.* To all appearances the word *rimmôn* is a primary noun that "migrated" from some unidentified language.[10] In Sumerian the pomegranate is called *(giš)nu-úr-ma* (from the Ur III period on), in Akkadian *nurmû* or *lurmû;* many varieties can be distinguished.[11] The word appears in many Semitic languages: Aram. *rimmônā'*,[12] Ugar. *lrmn*[*m*] (disputed: some interpret it as meaning "[wine] grape," oth-

---

RLA, III, 630ff.; S. Schroer, *In Israel gab es Bilder. OBO* 74 (1987), esp. 60-66; M. Zohary, *Plants of the Bible* (Eng. trans. London, 1982), esp. 62; *idem,* "רִמּוֹן," *EMiqr,* VII, 375ff.

II.3: J. C. Greenfield, "The Aramean God Rammān/Rimmōn," *IEJ* 26 (1976) 195-98; F. F. Hvidberg, *Weeping and Laughter in the OT* (Leiden, 1962), esp. 117-20; M. J. Mulder, "Der Gott Hadad im nordwestsemitischen Raum," in J. G. P. Best, ed., *Interaction and Acculturation in the Mediterranean,* I (Amsterdam, 1980), 69-83; *idem, Kanaänitische Goden in het OT* (Hague, 1965), esp. 81ff.

1. Engemann, 690; Börker-Klähn, 617; Zohary.
2. See, respectively, D. Irvin, *BRL*², 72; H. Weippert, *BRL*², 203.
3. Keimer, 49-50.
4. See the illustration of its migration in *RLA,* III, 631.
5. Engemann, 690.
6. See, e.g., the survey in Hehn; Börker-Klähn; Muthmann; Schroer, 63-66.
7. K. Galling, *BRL*², 33.
8. Börker-Klähn, 626.
9. Ohnefalsch and Richter.
10. *HAL;* cf. Hehn.
11. Röllig, 630; *AHw,* II, 804-5.
12. *DISO,* 281.

ers as meaning "pomegranate"[13]), Syr. *rummānā,*[14] Mand. *rumana,*[15] Arab. *rummān,*[16] Eth. *rōmān.*[17] The word also appears in other languages.[18]

II. 1. *Occurrences and Meaning.* Denoting the pomegranate tree or fruit in the botanical sense or used as a symbolic or decorative element, *rimmôn* (sg. or pl.) occurs 32 times in the OT: Ex. 28:33,34 (twice); 39:24; 39:25,26 (twice each); Nu. 13:23; 20:5; Dt. 8:8; 1 S. 14:2; 1 K. 7:8,20,42 (twice); 2 K. 25:17; Jer. 52:22,23 (twice each); Joel 1:12; Hag. 2:19; Cant. 4:3,13; 6:7,11; 7:13(Eng. 12); 8:2; 2 Ch. 3:16; 4:13 (twice); Sir. 45:9. The word appears also in several toponyms and anthroponyms and as the name of a deity.[19]

2. *Toponyms and Anthroponyms.* In toponyms we find the word *rimmôn,* presumably denoting the fruit or the tree,[20] in the following:

a. *ʿên rimmôn* (Josh. 15:32 [cj.]; 19:7; Zec. 14:10 [cj.]; Neh. 11:29; 1 Ch. 4:32), modern Khirbet Umm er-Ramāmīn, some 12 mi. northeast of Beersheba;[21]

b. *rimmônâ* (Josh. 19:13 for *rimmôn;* 21:35 for *dimnâ;* 1 Ch. 6:62[77] for *rimmônô*[22]), modern *Rummāne,* 6 mi. northwest of Nazareth;[23]

c. *rimmôn pereṣ* (Nu. 33:19-20: "pomegranate by the pass/cleft"[24]), possibly not far from the Gulf of Aqaba, according to Noth probably modern *Naqb el-Bdēye;*[25]

d. [*ṣelaʿ hā*]*rimmôn* (Jgs. 20:45,47; 21:13), modern *Rammūn,* about 5 mi. northeast of *rāmallâ;*[26]

e. *gat-rimmôn* (Josh. 19:45; 21:24; 1 Ch. 6:54[69]), a site in the territory of Dan, in the vicinity of *Tell el-Jerišē,* just under 5 mi. from Jaffa.[27] There is also another town of the same name in the territory of Manasseh (Josh. 21:25, if not a dittography from the preceding verse); modern *Rummānē,* northwest of Taanach.[28]

---

13. For the former see *UT,* no. 1397; *WUS,* no. 1483. For the latter see J. Gray, *The Legacy of Canaan. SVT* 5 (²1965), 102; *CML,* 159; *CML²,* 150.

14. *LexSyr,* 735.

15. T. Nöldeke, *Mandäische Grammatik* (Halle, 1875), §105; *MdD,* 430.

16. S. Fränkel, *Die aramäischen Fremdwörter im Arabischen* (Leiden, 1886), 142; cf. *NBSS,* 42.

17. *LexLingAeth,* 276-77.

18. K. Lokotsch, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der europäischen Wörter orientalischen Ursprungs* (Heidelberg, 1927), no. 1729.

19. See II.2, 3 below.

20. W. Borée, *Die alten Ortsnamen Palästinas* (Hildesheim, ²1968), 60, 100; Y. Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible* (Eng. trans. Philadelphia, ²1979), 110; Löw, 83ff., lists no fewer than sixteen!

21. F.-M. Abel, *Géographie de la Palestine,* II (Paris, 1938), 318; *GTTOT,* §317; *HAL,* II, 819; cf. O. Borowski, *BA* 40 (1977) 99; 51 (1988) 25: Tel Halif.

22. Borée, 40.

23. Abel, 437; *GTTOT,* §329 n. 163.

24. Borée, 90.

25. *ABLAK,* I, 70; cf. Abel, 214 *(Naqb el-Biyār); GTTOT,* §431.

26. Abel, 437; *GTTOT,* §638.

27. Abel, 327; *GTTOT,* §337, no. 21.

28. Abel, 327; *GTTOT,* §337, no. 23.

In 2 S. 4:2,5,9, *rimmôn* is the name of the father of the slayers of Ishbaal. It is not clear whether this name should be associated with the pomegranate (tree) or the deity.[29] It is also possible to treat the name as the theophoric element of a hypocoristicon.[30]

3. *Deities.* The Damascus temple of the Aramaic deity Rimmon is mentioned in 2 K. 5:18. This name appears as a theophoric element in Aramaic personal names (e.g., Tabrimmon, 1 K. 15:18) and outside the area of Aram.[31] We are probably dealing with a (West Semitic?) deity Rāmānu/Amurru adopted by the Arameans.[32] The name may have some connection with "thunder,"[33] a suggestion supported by the association with Hadad in the name Hadad-rimmon (Zec. 12:11). It is still unclear, however, whether the name denotes a deity, a person, or a place, although the first possibility is most likely.[34] The text speaks of (great) lamentation in the plain of Megiddo, probably a reference to regular rituals mourning a fertility god of Canaanite origin, whose name was "Hadad" and whose epithet was "the thunderer."[35]

4. *Cultic Usage.* As what may be the earliest pictorial representations of pomegranate trees show, the pomegranate played an important cultic role for many people.[36] In ancient Israel, too, the pomegranate often appears as a symbolic ornament in the cult. The description of the Solomonic temple and its furnishings speaks of hundreds of pomegranates in two rows around the latticework covering the capitals of the two bronze pillars Jachin and Boaz (1 K. 7:18,20,42; cf. also 2 K. 25:17; Jer. 52:22-23; 2 Ch. 3:16; 4:13).[37] (Görg suggests, less probably, that *rimmôn* here is an Egyptian loanword for "pillar."[38]) These pomegranates not only symbolized the characteristic produce of Canaan but were themselves Canaanite fertility symbols, which now played a role in the context of the cult of the Israelite temple,[39] just as the pillars themselves can be thought of as stylized "trees of life."[40]

The description of the priestly vestments also speaks of pomegranates of bluish and reddish purple and of crimson, alternating with apotropaic bells of gold, attached to the

---

29. D. Sivan, *Grammatical Analysis and Glossary of the Northwest Semitic Vocables in Akkadian Texts of the 15th-13th Centuries B.C. from Canaan and Syria. AOAT* 214 (1984), 264; contra *IPN,* 257.

30. See II.3 below.

31. Greenfield; Mulder, *Goden,* 81.

32. K. L. Tallqvist, *Akkadische Götter-Epitheta* (Helsinki, 1938), 437; R. Frankena, *Tākultu* (Leiden, 1954), 78.

33. E. Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das AT* (Giessen, ^{3}1902), 442-51.

34. See Hvidberg; H. Gese, in *idem,* M. Höfner, and K. Rudolph, *Die Religionen Altsyriens, Altarabiens und der Mandäer. RM* 10/2 (1970), 220-21. Cf. Mulder, *Goden,* 82-83; *idem,* "Hadad," 71-72.

35. For further discussion see Mulder, "Hadad."

36. Muthmann, 13ff.

37. E. Würthwein, *Könige I. ATD* XI/1 (1985), 76; Schroer, 60ff.

38. M. Görg, *BN* 13 (1980) 20-21.

39. Mulder, *Koningen I. COT* 261.

40. O. Keel, *The Symbolism of the Biblical World* (Eng. trans. New York, 1978), 163-64; Muthmann, 22-23.

lower hem of the ephod robe of the high priest (Ex. 28:33-34; cf. also 39:24ff.; Sir. 45:9), which Josephus interprets as symbolizing thunder and lightning.[41] Here we have the same symbolism as on the capitals of the pillars. One may compare the pomegranates decorating a tripod found in the ruins of the house of the high priest at Ugarit.[42]

5. *Song of Songs.* The pomegranate plays a prominent role in the metaphorical language of love used by the Song of Songs.[43] In the detailed description of the bride's beauty, 4:3 and 6:7 compare the *raqqâ* of the beloved to a *pelaḥ hārimmôn,* a slice from a pomegranate or — perhaps better — the vertical fissure of a pomegranate.[44] The word *raqqâ* is usually translated "temple," although the sequence of parts of the body mentioned in the verse and the vehicle of the metaphor itself suggest rather "open mouth" or "soft gums."[45] As in an Egyptian love poem, the seeds of the pomegranate may be likened to the bride's teeth.[46]

In 6:11 the man describes his path to his beloved as a walk through a nut orchard, in which pomegranate trees bloom among the budding grapevines. This image probably suggests that here the love of the two finds fulfillment.[47] Elsewhere, too, pomegranates — along with all kinds of exotic plants and fruits — are mentioned in conjunction with the excellence and beauty of the bride (4:13) or as a symbol of love play (7:13[12]). The drinking of pomegranate juice along with spiced wine (8:2) is a metaphor for the act of love, as the context clearly shows. It is also possible that the Song of Songs chooses pomegranates "on account of their affinity with long-forgotten gods and goddesses."[48]

6. *Other.* Elsewhere in the OT, the pomegranate appears primarily as one of the seven varieties of fruit with which the land of Israel is blessed (Dt. 8:8; cf. also Nu. 13:23; 20:5; Hag. 2:19).[49] When these dry up and wither, human joy turns to misery (Joel 1:12).

In 1 S. 14:2 it is not quite clear whether we are dealing simply with a toponym, as Tg. suggests (*šippûlê rimmôn,* "at the foot of Rimmon"; cf. Jgs. 20:45), an actual pomegranate tree — although it gives no shade[50] — under which Saul was sitting, or some quite specific tree. The third possibility depends on emending *migrôn* to *baggōren* or even better *bammigran,* "at the threshing floor."[51] In this case it is not im-

41. *Ant.* 3.194; *B.J.* 5.231.
42. A. Reichert, *BRL*², 193-94.
43. O. Keel, *ZBK* 18, 134ff.; Schroer, 61.
44. Keel, *ZBK* 18, 136.
45. W. Rudolph, *Das Hohelied. KAT* XVII/1-3 (1962), 144, 146-47; also E. W. Nicholson, *ZAW* 89 (1977) 259-66; Keel, *ZBK* 18, 136.
46. G. Gerleman, *Das Hohelied. BK* XVIII (1981), 147.
47. Rudolph, *KAT* XVII/1-3, 166.
48. H.-P. Müller, *Vergleich und Metapher im Hoheslied. OBO* 56 (1984), 26.
49. Zohary, *EMiqr,* VII, 375.
50. Dalman, *AuS,* I/1, 61.
51. As proposed by J. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis* (Göttingen, 1871), 85-86; H. P. Smith, *Samuel. ICC* (²1953) 104-5; H. J. Stoebe, *Die erste Buch Samuels. KAT* VIII/1 (1973), 258; *et al.*

possible that the pomegranate tree had special symbolic significance for a forensic or cultic site, comparable to the threshing floor of Danel in the Ugaritic Aqhat cycle.[52]

III. Versions. The LXX most often (21 times) translates *rimmôn* with *róa,* the usual Greek word for pomegranate (tree); it also uses *roískos* (6 times), as well as *anthinós* (Ex. 28:34) and *kṓdōn* (2 Ch. 4:13). The Vg. usually uses *malogranatum* for the tree (less frequently *malus punica*) and *malum punicum* for the fruit. In Aramaic the regular equivalent is *rimmônā',* in Syriac, *rummānā.*[53]

Mulder

52. *KTU,* 1.17, V, 6-7; 1.19, I, 22-23.
53. See I.2 above.

רָמַס *rāmas;* מִרְמָס *mirmās*

I. Root; Occurrences. II. Lexical Field; Meaning. III. LXX. IV. OT Usage. V. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Root; Occurrences. The root *rms* appears only in Hebrew and Jewish Aramaic. It is synonymous with the root *rps/rpś* (cf. Ezk. 34:18-19), attested in the Arabic verb *rafasa*[1] and the Syriac verb *rᵉpas.*[2] The verb from *rms* occurs 18 times in the qal in the OT and once in the niphal. The niphal in Isa. 28:3 is well supported by the versions.[3] The conflict between the plural predicate and singular subject may be resolved either by emending the subj. *ʿᵃṭārâ* to the plural or reading *tērāmasnâ* as an energic form of the third person fem. pl. *tērāmᵉsannâ.*[4] The noun *mirmās* occurs 7 times.

II. Lexical Field; Meaning. The basic meaning of the verb is "tread." In some texts it is connected directly with the subj. *regel/raglayim* (Isa. 26:6; Ezk. 34:18 the qal of *bô';* cf. Isa. 28:3); it also appears in parallel with synonymous verbs such as *rāpaś* (Ezk. 34:18) or *dāraḵ* (Isa. 63:3; Ps. 91:13) or after verbs of motion such as *ʿāḇar* (2 K. 14:9 par. 2 Ch. 25:18; Mic. 5:7) or *rāḏap/nāśag* hiphil (Ps. 7:6[Eng. 5]). In combina-

1. Wehr, 349.
2. *LexSyr,* 741.
3. Not listed in *KBL²*, 895.
4. For the former see *BHK;* O. Kaiser, *Das Buch Jesaja. ATD* XVIII (1981), 189. For the latter see *BHS;* H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 2002), 4.

tion with *rāmas,* the qal of *bô'* also appears to take on the meaning "trample" (Isa. 41:25; Nah. 3:14), if *bô'* should not be emended to *bûs* in both texts.[5]

Various contexts suggest semantic nuances. In the making of pottery (Isa. 41:25), bricks (Nah. 3:14), and wine (Isa. 63:3), *rāmas* may be a technical term for the treading of clay *(ṭîṭ),* mortar *(ḥōmer),* or grapes in the winepress *(pûrâ),* in each case a process preliminary to the actual manufacture of the product.

Animals are often the subject: *ḥayyaṯ haśśāḏeh* (2 K. 14:9 par. 2 Ch. 25:18), *sûsîm* (2 K. 9:33; therefore read: *wayirmᵉsûhā*[6]), *'aryēh/kᵉp̄îr* (Mic. 5:7[8]), *ṣᵉp̄îr hā'izzîm* (Dnl. 8:7; cf. v. 5). In these cases *rāmas* usually describes the devastating effect of the animals' hooves and claws.

This image may then be transferred to human beings: *hā'ām* (2 K. 7:17,20; cf. Isa. 1:12), *'ôyēḇ* (Ps. 7:6[5]; cf. Isa. 16:4; Ezk. 34:18). The objects trampled are quite diverse: thorns (*ḥôaḥ,* 2 K. 14:9), pasture (*mir'eh,* Ezk. 34:18), the temple court (*ḥāṣēr,* Isa. 1:12), streets (*ḥûṣôṯ,* Ezk. 26:11), a crown (*'ᵃṭārâ,* Isa. 28:3), human beings (2 K. 7:17,20; 9:33; Isa. 26:6; Ps. 7:6[5]), and animals (Mic. 5:7[8]; Ps. 91:13; Dnl. 8:7).

The destructive aspect appears also in the qal ptcp. *rōmēs* in Isa. 16:4, which parallels "oppressor" (read: *ḥômēṣ*) and "destroyer" (read: *šôḏēḏ*).[7]

The noun *mirmās* takes its meaning "trampling, overtrodden land"[8] from the verb, and is itself highly verbal in nature. The verbal usage appears in the common construction *hāyâ lᵉmirmās* (Isa. 5:5 par. *hāyâ lᵉḇā'ēr;* 7:25; 28:18; Mic. 7:10), in which *mirmās* plays the role of the infinitive (cf. also Isa. 10:6 LXX, *katapateín*). We find *mirmās* used as a simple noun only in Dnl. 8:13 (which has textual problems), in a list that probably concludes with *ṣāḇā' ûmirmās,* "toil and trampling."[9]

III. LXX. The LXX usually uses a form of *pateín* to translate the verb: *katapateín* (9 times), *sympateín* (5 times), *pateín* (twice). We also find *syntríbein* (Dnl. 8:7) and the interpretive translations *katathleín* (Isa. 63:3) and *diastéllein* (Mic. 5:7[8]). Except in Isa. 10:6, the noun *mirmās* is represented by *katapátēma.*[10]

IV. OT Usage. The meaning and lexical field of *rms* make it natural that the OT should use the root primarily in the prophetic literature in the context of judgment oracles. The root may appear in an accusation: the people are charged with trampling the courts of the temple (Isa. 1:12); the powerful carelessly foul the pasturage and water supply with their feet, leaving no food or drink for the weak members of the flock *(ṣō'n),* i.e., the people (Ezk. 34:18-19). Much more frequently, however, *rāmas* and *mirmās* describe the judgment itself: Yahweh will remove hedge and wall from the vineyard of Israel, so that it will be devoured *(bā'ēr)* and exposed to trampling

---

5. *BHS; HAL,* I, 115.
6. *BHS.*
7. Kaiser, *ATD* XVIII, 50.
8. *HAL,* II, 637.
9. O. Plöger, *Das Buch Daniel. KAT* XVIII (1965), 122.
10. See G. Bertram, "πατέω," *TDNT,* V, 941-43.

(mirmās) (Isa. 5:5); Judah will be the spoil and plunder of Assyria, to be trodden like the mire of the streets (Isa. 10:6; cf. the similar language against the enemy of Jerusalem in Mic. 7:10); Nebuchadnezzar's horses will trample *(rāmas)* the streets of Tyre (Ezk. 26:11); "trampled underfoot will be the proud 'crowns' of the drunkards of Ephraim" (Isa. 28:3).[11] In Isa. 28:18 the prophet announces that judgment will come as an "overwhelming torrent": everything will be "beaten down" *(mirmās)* by it.

Even in narratives texts, 3 of the 5 occurrences of *rāmas* describe the fulfillment of a prophetic threat. Both the death of the king's adjutant *(hammelek̲ hip̲qîd̲),* who is trampled in the gate by the people (2 K. 7:17,20), and the death of Jezebel, who is thrown from a window and trampled by the horses of Jehu (2 K. 9:33), are preceded by prophecies of judgment. Even the texts where *rāmas* suggests a kind of necessary labor contain threatening overtones: as a potter treads clay, so has Cyrus trampled down the rulers of Babylon (Isa. 41:25); in Isa. 63:3 (the only text where Yahweh is the subject), it is Yahweh himself in his wrath and anger who tramples the nations in a winepress. In an oracle of judgment the prophet ironically calls on the capital of Assyria to strengthen its fortifications, among other things by trampling the clay and treading the mortar (Nah. 3:14).

Only rarely does *rāmas* appear in the context of oracles of salvation. According to Isa. 16:4, salvation begins when the "marauder" *(rōmēs)* has vanished from the land *(min hā'āreṣ);* according to 26:6, salvation is at hand when those who dominate the world ("the inhabitants of the height") are cast down into the dust by Yahweh (v. 5) and are trampled by the feet of the poor *('ānî)* and needy *(dallîm).* Isa. 7:25 promises (probably in contrast to 5:5[12]) that the hills will once again be passable pasturage *(mišlaḥ)* for cattle and sheep — leading naturally to their being trampled.

Mic. 5:7(8) likens the "remnant of Jacob" among the nations to an invulnerable lion, which drags *(rāmas)* any other animal to the ground and tears it to pieces *(ṭārap̲).* We also find *rāmas* used to describe a battle in Daniel's second vision of the ram and the goat (Dnl. 8:7; cf. the similar description of the horn in v. 10).

Ps. 91:13 promises the "faithful" that they will "stride over lions and adders,"[13] while in Ps. 7 the psalmist prays that, if he has done any wrong, the enemy may pursue him and trample his life to the ground (*w^eyirmōs lā'āreṣ,* v. 6[5]). In 2 K. 14:9 par. 2 Ch. 25:18, a parable uses *rāmas* to describe wild animals trampling down an arrogant thornbush.

V. Dead Sea Scrolls. The Dead Sea Scrolls use the qal (1QH 6:32) and niphal (4QpNah 1:3; 4Q381 fr. 46, 8) of the verb and the noun *mirmās* (1QH 8:8) in the same sense as the OT. In 1QM 9:11 *l^ehāmēs* should be read instead of *l^erāmôs.*

Waschke

---

11. Kaiser, *ATD* XVIII, 189.
12. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1991), 326.
13. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1989), 220. See also P. Hugger, *Jahwe meine Zuflucht* (Münster, 1971), 248ff.

רָמַשׂ *rāmaś*; רֶמֶשׂ *remeś*

I. 1. Etymology; Meaning; Usage; 2. LXX and Dead Sea Scrolls. II. 1. Creation and Deluge; 2. Laws.

I. 1. *Etymology; Meaning; Usage.* Whether Heb. *rāmaś* is related to Akk. *namāšu,* "move, set out," *nammaštu,* "that which moves, fauna,"[1] is uncertain. The interpretation of Ugar. *rm* as "crawl, swarm" is disputed.[2] Outside the Bible, the root appears in Jewish Aram. *remes/remeś,* "creeping things."[3]

The similar Semitic root *rms/š,* found, e.g., in Arab. *ramaša,* "pick up with one's finger tips,"[4] Ethiopic "touch,"[5] and Syr. *r^emisā,* "soft, gentle,"[6] may be different in origin.

The verb *rāmaś* occurs 17 times in the OT; its derivative *remeś* occurs 16 times. The verb describes the locomotion of various creatures that "creep" or "crawl" over the ground, either scuttling on very short legs or wriggling like a snake. Since many of these creatures are amphibians, the OT also finds such animals in the water (Lev. 11:46; in Gen. 1:21, the ptcp. *rōmēś* parallels "fish of the sea"; cf. also Ps. 69:35[Eng. 34]; 104:25). The verb is often followed by the prep. *'al* (Gen. 1:26,28,30; 7:8,14,21; 8:17,19; Lev. 11:44; Ezk. 38:20), less frequently *b^e* (Dt. 4:18) or the accusative (Gen. 9:2; Lev. 20:25).

Closest in meaning to *rāmaś* is → שׁרץ *šāraṣ,* "creep, swarm," with its derived noun *šereṣ,* "swarm." Both *rāmaś* and *šāraṣ* refer primarily to movement. In the list of swarming creatures classified as unclean *(ṭāmē')* by Lev. 11:24-40, there is an overlap between those categorized as *šereṣ* and those categorized as *remeś* (cf. vv. 44,46).

The list of species that Lev. 11:29-30 included in the general category *remeś* shows that, although the group that we would today call reptiles constitutes a significant portion, *rāmaś* and *remeś* are not limited to these. A significant number of insects are

---

rāmaś. M. P. Caroll, "One More Time: Leviticus Revisited," *Archives européennes de sociologie* 19 (1978) 339-46 = B. Lang, ed., *Anthropological Approaches to the OT.* Issues in Religion and Theology (Philadelphia, 1985), 117-26; M. Douglas, *Implicit Meanings* (London, 1975); *idem, Purity and Danger* (New York, 1966); J. Hempel, "Gott, Mensch und Tier im AT mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Gen 1–3," *Zeitschrift für Systematische Theologie* 9 (1931) 211-49 = *Apoxysmata. BZAW* 81 (1961), esp. 198-229; M.-L. Henry, *Das Tier im religiösen Bewusstsein des alttestamentlichen Menschen. SgV* 220/221 (1958); S. Herrmann, "Die Naturlehre des Schöpfungsberichtes," *TLZ* 86 (1961) 412-24 = *Gesammelte Studien zur Geschichte und Theologie. ThB* 75 (1986), 32-46; W. H. Schmidt, *Die Schöpfungsgeschichte der Priesterschrift. WMANT* 17 (^{2}1967).

1. *AHw,* II, 728; cf. *HAL,* III, 1245.
2. *KTU,* 1.2 V, 3. Cf. J. C. de Moor and K. Spronk, *A Cuneiform Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit* (Leiden, 1987), 169.
3. *WTM,* IV, 455; Jastrow, 1483.
4. Wehr, 360.
5. *LexLingAeth,* 276.
6. *LexSyr,* 735.

clearly included, as well as marine mammals. There is no evident classification system defining the individual species (→ מִין *mîn*).

2. *LXX and Dead Sea Scrolls.* The LXX uses *hérpein* to translate both *rāmaś* and *šāraṣ,* and *herpetón* for the corresponding nouns.

In the Dead Sea Scrolls both the verb *rāmaś* (CD 12:13) and the noun (l. 12) denote a class of animals considered unclean. In 4Q502 fr. 8, which is difficult to interpret, the reptiles that creep upon the earth (l. 3), together with other animals, appear to be the subject of cosmic glorification *(brk).*

In the Hebrew text of Sir. 10:11, *remeś* refers to the living creatures that decompose the dead in the grave.

II. 1. *Creation and Deluge.* In the Priestly creation account, the creatures described as *remeś* are created on the sixth day, together with humankind and other large land animals (Gen. 1:24,25 [noun]; 1:26,28,30 [verb]). Since fish and other swarming creatures had already been created on the fifth day, P implies a distinction between *šereṣ* and *remeś.* The Priestly document assigns living creatures to five classes: fish (Gen. 1:26,28), birds (1:20ff.,26,28), cattle (1:24ff.), wild animals (living in the countryside, 1:24-25,30), and creeping things (1:24ff.,30). This classification is based on the different domains in which the creatures move about, with the "land animals" subdivided into domestic animals, wild animals, and creeping things. It is not stated explicitly that many of the species comprised by *remeś* are amphibians.[7]

On the whole the reader does not gain the impression that P is drawing on a well-defined traditional schema available for incorporation into the Priestly creation account, although the narrative itself appears to establish such a schema.[8] It is noteworthy that the text says nothing of a blessing upon the creatures of the land and sea after their creation. In sum, the strange style of locomotion employed by creeping and swarming animals, possibly in combination with their living immediately above or below the surface of the earth, has assigned them a lower rank in creation. Accordingly, "swarming creatures," including creeping animals, are viewed as unclean.[9]

In the deluge narrative (Gen. 6:1–8:22), the creatures affected by Yahweh's determination to blot out life from the earth are divided into four classes: humankind, cattle/beasts (NRSV "animals"), *remeś,* and birds (6:7). Two each of every kind of *remeś* are saved by Noah (6:20; 7:8,14; 8:17,19); the animals left behind are annihilated by the deluge (7:21,23). On the surviving *remeś,* like all animate creatures, will rest fear and dread of human beings (9:2). They are all given to humans for food.

Other OT texts, too, commonly divide the animal kingdom into four classes: birds, animals, fish, and *remeś* (Dt. 4:17-18; 1 K. 5:13[4:33]; Ezk. 38:20). But this classification is not set in stone. Four classes still appear in Ps. 148:10, but as "wild animals, cat-

---

7. On the basis for such a classification see Douglas, *Purity,* 41ff.; *idem, Meanings,* 275ff.; Caroll.

8. C. Westermann, *Genesis 1-11* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1984), 168.

9. See also II.2 below.

tle, birds, and *remeś*." Hos. 2:20(18), however, has only three classes of creatures that participate in Yahweh's eschatological covenant with the animal kingdom. Hab. 1:14 mentions *remeś* in parallel with fish, which live in the sea and have no ruler. The prophecy of a divine judgment on "all the creeping things that creep upon the ground" (Ezk. 38:20) serves to demonstrate the cosmic extent of Yahweh's judgment upon Gog.[10] In a similar vein Ps. 104:25 speaks of the "creeping things innumerable in the sea" to illustrate the cosmic extent of Yahweh's providential care. In the same psalm v. 20 uses the verb *rāmaś* to describe the nocturnal prowling of wild animals. The reference to Yahweh's care for such lowly beasts, even those that are hostile to human beings, suggests that Hebrew thought adhered to a hierarchy of creation that relegated fish and *remeś* to the very bottom.

We do not find a more precise categorization of the various kinds of creatures, although Hebrew thought does reflect a certain distinction between "higher" and "lower" species. In this hierarchy the "creeping" animals occupy the lowest position. Their position may be explained in part as a consequence of their living in unpleasant and often unhealthy environments. The Levitical legislation of Lev. 11:29-47 assigns the creatures classified as *remeś* to the broader category of "swarming" creatures. Once again, the classification is based on mode of locomotion and the environment in which the creature moves. Measured by this criterion, amphibians appear anomalous.

2. *Laws.* Dt. 4:18 explicitly prohibits making any kind of image or statue of *remeś*. This prohibition appears to influence Ezk. 8:10, which speaks of images *(tabnîṯ)* of "creeping things" and other "loathsome animals" *(bᵉhēmâ šeqeṣ)* on the interior walls of the Jerusalem temple. Here the LXX offers a shorter text,[11] speaking simply of images (wall carvings?) of unclean animals. The MT has been expanded to reflect Dt. 4:17-18 in order to underline the condemnation of image making, which is a fundamental element of idolatry. The original function of such iconography is obscure, so that it is impossible to determine whether the creatures referred to by the prophet are real or mythological.

The ordinances stipulating what kinds of creatures are to be classified as unclean (Lev. 11:24-47) call a large proportion of them *šereṣ* and unclean (v. 41). This category includes many species that "creep" upon the earth (v. 44) or in the water (v. 46). It appears fundamentally correct to include in the category *remeś* all animals that modern zoology calls reptiles, even though the biblical category was clearly broader and less precise. The list in vv. 29-30 is pertinent: six of the eight species are reptiles. Since the mode of locomotion ("swarm, creep") is a critical feature for determining the various classes of animals that are unclean, it is possible to ask whether this factor is not itself a significant aspect of what makes an animal "unclean" *(ṭāmēʾ)*.[12]

Clements

10. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 313.
11. G. A. Cooke, *Ezekiel. ICC* (1985), 94-95, 102.
12. See Douglas; Caroll.

רָנַן *rānan;* רִנָּה *rinnâ;* רְנָנָה *r^enānâ;* רְנָנִים *r^enānîm*

I. Etymology. II. Occurrences. III. Rejoicing: 1. Yahweh's Help and Deliverance; 2. Yahweh as King; 3. Yahweh as Creator; 4. Justice and Judgment; 5. Cult; 6. Miscellaneous; 7. Individual Rejoicing; 8. Subjects. IV. Lamentation. V. Sirach and Dead Sea Scrolls. VI. LXX.

I. Etymology. Outside Hebrew, the root *rnn* appears frequently in Egyptian as the verb *rnn* and the noun *rnnw.t,*[1] as well as in Ugaritic,[2] always in the positive sense of rejoicing. There may also be a relationship with Akk. *ernettu(m).*[3] The root appears also in Palmyrene,[4] Jewish Aramaic, and Christian Palestinian Aramaic.[5]

II. Occurrences. The original usage of the root *rnn* is still reflected in Prov. 1:20 and 8:3, which describe Wisdom as "raising her voice" or "crying out," without specifying any particular content.[6] Job 39:23 may also belong here, if the hapax legomenon *tirneh* is emended to *tārōnnâ.*[7] By associating *qôl* and *rinnâ,* Ps. 47:2(Eng. 1) likewise emphasizes that the use of *rnn* presupposes a loud outburst. Crüsemann postulates that *rnn,* like *gîl* and *psḥ,* "whatever their origin, do not refer to articulated speech or song."[8] This statement cannot be maintained in its full generality, however; in Ps. 47:2(1), as in all other texts, there appears at least a discursive statement involving either the semantic field of joy[9] or that of (lamenting) petition. Only Job 39:13, where *r^enānîm* may mean "female ostriches,"[10] stands totally outside this semantic spectrum.

The use of *rnn* in connection with joyous outbursts, where it can be understood in the sense of "rejoice, exult," is concentrated in the Psalms (34 times) and the book of Isaiah (20 times, including 9 in Deutero-Isaiah). This usage appears also in Leviticus, Deuteronomy, 1-2 Chronicles, Job (4 times), Proverbs (twice), Jeremiah (3 times), Zephaniah (twice), and Zechariah.

---

rānan. F. Crüsemann, *Studien zur Formgeschichte von Hymnus und Danklied in Israel. WMANT* 32 (1969), esp. 32-82; R. Ficker, "רנן *rnn* jubeln," *THAT,* II, 781-86; J. Jeremias, *Das Königtum Gottes in den Psalmen. FRLANT* 141 (1987); R. Lauha, *Psychophysischer Sprachgebrauch im AT. AnAcScFen* 35 (1983); H. P. Müller, "Die sog. Straussenperikope in den Gottesreden des Hiobbuches," *ZAW* 100 (1988) 90-105; N. E. Wagner, "רִנָּה in the Psalter," *VT* 10 (1960) 435-41.

1. *WbÄS,* II, 435.
2. *WUS,* no. 2520; *KTU,* 1.82, 6.
3. *AHw,* I, 242-43.
4. *DISO,* 281.
5. *HAL,* III, 1247.
6. On Prov. 1:20 see M. Dahood, *RSP,* III, 153; on 8:3 see *ibid.,* 145, 153.
7. *Ibid.,* 153.
8. P. 48.
9. For example, → גיל *gîl,* → ידה *yāḏâ,* → הלל *hll* I and II; שׂמח *śāmaḥ.*
10. For a full discussion of this interpretation, see Müller.

Use of the root in the context of lamentation is also concentrated in the Psalms (Ps. 17:1; 61:2[1]; 88:3[2]; 106:44; 119:169; 142:7[6]); it appears also in 1 K. 8:28 par. 2 Ch. 6:19; 1 K. 22:36; Jer. 7:16; 11:14; 14:12.

III. Rejoicing. When we turn to the texts that use *rnn* in a positive sense, we note that the motive for the expression of joy is religion — even in Job 29:13, where Job declares that he caused the widow's heart to sing for song. As a consequence, almost universally it is Yahweh to whom the resounding expressions of joy are directed. Now if we inquire into the reasons for this rejoicing, a highly diversified picture emerges. Seldom do we find a single cause; usually several motivations intersect. It is often not just specific reasons but a complex of experiences extending over a lengthy period that provide the context motivating the use of *rnn.* If we attempt nevertheless to categorize the usage, something like the following schema emerges:

1. *Yahweh's Help and Deliverance.* Foremost is the people's experience of Yahweh's acts of salvation and deliverance. Most texts refer to such acts in the immediate or distant past, but often expectation of imminent demonstrations of God's salvation is the reason for rejoicing.

a. The texts in the Psalms in particular speak of Yahweh's past deeds on behalf of his people (Ps. 47:2[1]; 81:2[1]; 98:4; 105:43; 107:22; 145:7; 149:5; see also Isa. 12:6); of these, Ps. 47:2(1), 81:2(1), 98:4, and 107:22 (and Isa. 12:6) summon the people to rejoice, while the other texts describe the act of rejoicing (cf. Isa. 14:7 [probably postexilic[11]], where the whole world rejoices over the fall of the king of Babylon).

It is noteworthy that hardly any specific events are mentioned; instead, we find summary formulas. In most texts we are reminded of Yahweh's acts in history, which Ps. 81 associates with the law. Apart from Isa. 14:7, Ps. 107:22 comes closest to suggesting a concrete act of deliverance in the immediate past, for it appears to call on those who have recovered from sickness to rejoice (cf. vv. 17-18). The larger context shows, however, that the text is speaking of Yahweh's action on behalf of his people, transcending the experience of individuals. One gets the impression that the formulation of the text is deliberately left open, that concrete details are deliberately avoided, in order that as many as possible may join in jubilant praise of Yahweh for what he has already done.

b. The texts in the book of Isaiah (except for 14:7) are oriented more toward the future. They are also much more specific regarding the nature of what is expected, since it emerges in each case from the concrete situation. According to 35:2,6, the desert and even — as a hyperbolic symbol of God's extraordinary act of salvation — the speechless will rejoice, because all creation will take on new splendor in the light of the people's return. The returnees themselves will also break forth in song, bringing with them everlasting joy (35:10; 51:11).

Deutero-Isaiah envisions proleptically the people's expected deliverance and return when he calls for rejoicing (44:23; 48:20; 49:13; 52:9; probably also 54:1, although

11. O. Kaiser, *Das Buch Jesaja. ATD* XVIII (1981), 29.

many scholars delete *rinnâ* for metrical reasons[12]) and when the mountains burst into song before the returnees (55:12). Both 49:13 and 52:9 also link the awaited deliverance with comfort given by Yahweh as motivation for a call to rejoice. Besides the praise uttered by all creation, 42:10ff. calls on the desert and those who dwell among the crags to rejoice because Yahweh is about to go forth as a warrior (implicitly, to deliver his people). This passage recalls Dt. 32:43, although Yahweh himself is not the object of *rnn* in the latter passage: the nations are called upon to break forth in rejoicing on behalf of Yahweh's people, albeit because of what Yahweh has done.[13] We find *rnn* in a hymnic context in Isa. 44:23, in a summons to creation to break forth in rejoicing at the coming deliverance of Jacob. This frequent inclusion of the whole universe in the rejoicing over the return of the people shows that Yahweh's actions on behalf of Israel have significance for the whole world, not just for Israel.

In Isa. 61:7 we should probably follow Marti and Westermann in reading *dārōq* instead of *yārōnnû,* since this emendation makes better sense of v. 7a.[14] Finally, in Isa. 65:14 Yahweh promises that his servants will rejoice on account of the gladness he will bring to them, while those who forsake him will have reason to despair.

Jer. 31:7 and 12 also envision the imminent return from the Diaspora, along with the people's enjoyment of the gifts of creation in their own land (even should we accept Duhm's proposal to treat *w*^{e}*rinn*^{e}*nû* as a preferred variant to *w*^{e}*nāh*^{a}*rû*[15]). The form *hôšaʿ* in v. 7 (to be read *hôšîaʿ*[16]) probably envisions an event anticipated in the future rather than belonging to the past.[17] Finally, the return of the exiles is also anticipated by the rejoicing of the heavens and the earth over the imminent destruction of Babylon (Jer. 51:48; cf. v. 45).

The tenses in Ps. 126 have been the subject of much discussion, but the use of *rnn* in vv. 5 and 6 (cf. also v. 2) of this psalm (which also has affinities to Deutero-Isaiah) should clearly be subsumed under the aspect of anticipation of a salvific future. Confident of this anticipated salvation, the psalmist can already rejoice proleptically.

Also future-oriented, but more rooted in the domain of private (albeit collective) circumstances, is Ps. 90:14, with its prayer for lifelong rejoicing in God's steadfast love. It remains an open question whether the *w*^{e} that links v. 14b to the prayer for Yahweh's help in v. 14a introduces a final clause ("in order that") or a promise made to Yahweh in order to gain his aid. The parallel to v. 12 suggests the first interpretation.

2. *Yahweh as King.* Closely associated with the experience of Yahweh's intervention in history is the observation that Yahweh's kingship, embodying his power and his

---

12. Following B. Duhm, *Jesaja. HKAT* III/1 (^{5}1968), 407; K. Marti, *Das Buch Jesaja. KHC* X (1900), 353.

13. P. Buis and J. Leclerq, *Le Deutéronome* (Paris, 1963), 201, therefore propose to construe *ʿammô* in apposition to *gôyîm.*

14. Marti, *KHC* X, 387; C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1969), 368 n. d.

15. B. Duhm, *Das Buch Jeremia. KHC* XI (1901), 247.

16. See *BHS.*

17. Duhm, *KHC,* XI, 246.

presence, is itself grounds for rejoicing — once more especially in the Psalms (Ps. 47:2[1]; 98:4) and the book of Isaiah (Isa. 12:6; 24:14; 35:2; 52:7[8]), but also in 1 Ch. 16:33; Zeph. 3:14,17; and Zech. 2:14(10). "Praise is due God both as 'our king' (Ps. 47:7[6]) or 'my king' (Ps. 68:25[24]), manifest in particular historical experiences, and as 'great king over all the earth' (Ps. 47:3[2]), manifest in universal power."[18] Sellin suggests reading Zeph. 3:17 as a gloss on v. 15;[19] but this interpretation is not necessary, especially since v. 17 is unique in making Yahweh the grammatical subject of *rnn:* Yahweh rejoices over Zion/Israel in its midst.

Isa. 24:14 presents a particular problem. Following a description of the destruction of the earth, concentrating on "the city" (Moab or Babylon?[20]), we read: *hēmmâ yiśʾû qôlām yārōnnû*. But who are the *hēmmâ* who are the subjects of the clause? We can rule out the inhabitants of the city and the previously named peoples, since those who have just survived destruction can hardly rejoice. Some have suggested identifying *hēmmâ* with Israel, or more precisely the Jews of the worldwide Diaspora.[21] Marti had already identified *hēmmâ* as the "Jews of the western Diaspora": "'They' have a different view of the situation than does the author; they rejoice over an event in which they can recognize Yahweh's sovereignty, a glorious act of God . . . in which they see the beginning of their deliverance."[22] The expression *mîyām* supports this interpretation, but the text does not permit an unequivocal identification.

Ps. 84:3(2); 95:1; and 96:12 also emphasize the greatness and sovereignty of Yahweh as grounds for rejoicing, but without reference to any specific historical event. Ps. 84 is concerned primarily with Yahweh's presence in the temple, suggesting ties to the cult. Kraus translates *rnn* in v. 3(2) as "cry out," but the context easily supports the translation "rejoice."[23] Ps. 95 and 96 also speak of Yahweh as creator, the topic of the next section.

3. *Yahweh as Creator.* The theme of Yahweh as creator and the gifts of creation is another context in which we find the root *rnn;* we have met this theme already in Jer. 31:12. Here again the texts are concentrated in the Psalms, always in a hymn (89:13[12]; 95:1; 100:2) or song of thanksgiving (65:9[8]). According to 89:13(12), Tabor and Hermon, mountains of the gods, rejoice at the name of Yahweh; the context involves Yahweh's battle with chaos. Ps. 100:2 establishes a link with the cult: *rinnâ* is to take place in Yahweh's presence. Universal jubilation celebrating God's creative power and the consequent abundant harvest is described by 65:9(8), with morning and evening, the realms of sunrise and sunset, as the subject of the verb. Finally, Isa. 35:2 alludes to a new creation: the desert will rejoice and blossom.

---

18. Jeremias, 74.

19. E. Sellin, *Das Zwölfprophetenbuch. KAT* XII ([2-3]1929-30), 393.

20. P. Auvray, *Isaïe 1–39* (Paris, 1972), 227.

21. For the former see, e.g., Kaiser, *ATD* XVIII, 151. For the latter, H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1997), 452-53.

22. Marti, *KHC,* X, 185.

23. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1989), 165.

4. *Justice and Judgment.* The experience or expectation of Yahweh's *ṣ^eḏāqâ* is the background of Ps. 51:16(14); 71:23; 145:7; in the first two instances the context is a vow of praise. Ps. 32:11 calls on the righteous to praise Yahweh because they have experienced his help. The larger context of 32:11 and 51:16(14) speaks of God's forgiveness, thus including it in the motivation for rejoicing. The protection that the *ṣaddîq* has received from Yahweh is the occasion for rejoicing in 5:12(11), while 92:5(4) speaks of rejoicing over the just governance of Yahweh. In 35:27, by contrast, the psalmist awaits vindication in the future, that those who support him may rejoice.

According to 1 Ch. 16:33, the trees of the forest rejoice before Yahweh, because he comes to judge *(špṭ)* the world and thus defends it with his steadfast love. Ps. 67:5(4) calls on the nations to rejoice and be glad because God judges the peoples with equity.

Isa. 65:14; Prov. 11:10; and 29:6 probably also belong to this category. In the first, only the context suggests that the security and prosperity of those who belong to Yahweh and the misfortunes of Yahweh's enemies are the cause of their rejoicing. Prov. 11:10 contrasts the respective fates of the upright and the wicked. According to 29:6, the righteous can sing and rejoice, while the wicked are ensnared in their transgressions. Emendation of *yārûn* to *yārûṣ* is unnecessary, especially since the following *w^eśāmēaḥ* confirms the root *rnn.*[24]

Job 20:5 also belongs here: the wicked may exult, but their joy is short-lived, lasting only for a moment. Only the upright, therefore, can truly rejoice.

5. *Cult.* A cultic background can be seen in Lev. 9:24, where the people rejoice when the offering is consumed: "This is the *rinnâ,* the loud ringing cry of the worshipper."[25] The rejoicing associated with (temple) festivals is suggested by Ps. 42:5(4) and 81:2(1); Ps. 81 even mentions the accompanying musical instruments. Ps. 100:2 clearly refers to the temple (cf. v. 4; also 84:3[2]). It is reasonable to believe that at least the texts calling for (hymnic) rejoicing have their setting in the worship of the temple and that this rejoicing is therefore cultic. It is not possible, however, to associate it with a specific cultic event or festival.[26] To trace the terminology back to the fertility cult, as Crüsemann does,[27] leaves several unresolved questions in the case of *rnn,* especially in the light of the root's other main use in the context of precatory lamentation.

6. *Miscellaneous.* The call to rejoice in Ps. 33:1 associates the (upright) word of Yahweh with his work of creation and his governance of the world.

According to Ps. 132:9, the enduring existence of the Davidic dynasty is grounds for rejoicing. Ps. 20:6(5), too, focuses on the king: the people who intercede on the king's behalf want to shout for joy over his victory. Here we see once more the proleptic rejoicing that anticipates a victory yet to come. In 2 Ch. 20:22, also, the battle begins with rejoicing that springs from confidence in victory.

---

24. Contra *BHS;* cf. O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos. BK* XVII (1984), 341, 344.
25. N. H. Snaith, *Leviticus and Numbers. NCBC* (1967), 74.
26. But see Jeremias, 156; Wagner, 438; Lauha, 72.
27. P. 64.

Isa. 26:19 associates rejoicing with deliverance from death, i.e., resurrection. The entire text appears to be so constructed as to culminate in *rnn,* so that resurrection is grounded in jubilation.[28]

Two texts involve a negative: Isa. 16:10 prophesies that a devastating enemy invasion will silence the rejoicing of harvest time; and in Job 3:7 Job curses the day of his conception as a day when there should be no sound of rejoicing.

The text of Isa. 43:14 is probably corrupt.[29]

7. *Individual Rejoicing.* The texts that refer to individual experience are concerned primarily with hope for deliverance from the threats of enemies. In Ps. 42 the psalmist in distress recalls the time when he went rejoicing to the temple, keeping festival with the throng (v. 5[4]). This memory gives him confidence that one day he will again have reason to give God thanks. According to v. 10(9), the psalmist is oppressed by enemies; but there are no further details concerning his distress, which is described only in a variety of images open to a wide range of interpretations. Ps. 59:17(16) likewise conveys the psalmist's assurance that Yahweh will deliver him from the torments of the enemies who are seeking his life. The psalmist of Ps. 63, having experienced Yahweh's help in the past, hopes for this help again to deliver him from his oppressors; secure in this hope, he already rejoices to sing Yahweh's praises (vv. 6,8[5,7]). In 71:23 the psalmist, hoping for Yahweh's help in the face of the enemy even to old age, speaks proleptically of rejoicing. Ps. 118:15 can speak already of the sound of rejoicing, since deliverance from the enemy has already taken place and the psalmist has escaped death.

These texts clearly avoid specifics concerning the enemies and their conduct so that many can echo or join in the psalm.

Ps. 30:6(5) speaks of rejoicing over deliverance from sickness; again, however, the text goes beyond the horizon of the individual, calling on the faithful to praise God on account of what the psalmist has experienced (v. 5[4]). The fate of the individual thus becomes paradigmatic.

8. *Subjects.* The variety of the subjects rejoicing is striking. In the foreground stand the people of Israel or groups of Israelites who rejoice or are called on to do so. We also find the gentile world as a whole, which breaks forth in rejoicing over what Yahweh has done. Beyond the human realm, nature is included in the expression of joy. Here we see a special affinity between the Psalms and Deutero-Isaiah, for this universal rejoicing appears primarily in Ps. 96 and 98 and Isa. 44:23; 49:13; 55:12.[30] These texts make clear that rejoicing in Yahweh is by no means restricted to a particular group; it can be all-embracing and universal, because its occasions are similarly all-embracing

---

28. On the function of the impv. *rannᵉnû,* see H. D. Preuss, "'Auferstehung' in Texten alttestamentlicher Apokalyptik (Jes 26,7-19; Dan 12,1-4)," in U. Gerber and E. Güttgemanns, eds., *"Linguistische" Theologie* (Bonn, 1972), 101-33.

29. K. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja. BK* XI/1 (1989), 331, 339.

30. Jeremias, 126.

and universal, and the one to whom the jubilation is addressed acts not just on behalf of a particular group: the scope of God's action is universal.

The usage in Zeph. 3:17, where Yahweh is the subject of the verb, is totally different.[31]

IV. Lamentation. Except for Lam. 2:19, which uses the qal of *rnn,* it is the noun *rinnâ* that appears in the context of lamentation, usually in combination with *tᵉpillâ.* The use of these two words in parallel shows that here *rinnâ* is used primarily in the sense of "plea, petition." Thus Solomon prays that his plea will be heard (1 K. 8:28 par.) and the psalmists that their sufferings will be relieved when they pray that their *rinnâ* will be heard. This meaning finds clear expression in Ps. 106:44, which speaks of Yahweh's regarding his people's distress in parallel with hearing their lament. In Jer. 7:16 and 11:14, Yahweh forbids the prophet to raise a cry or prayer on behalf of his people, on account of their wicked conduct. In Jer. 14:12, too, intercession is in vain, because Yahweh refuses to hear the cry of the people. Lam. 2:19, by contrast, calls on the people to cry out before Yahweh, lamenting the terrible destruction. Finally, according to 1 K. 22:36 a cry of lamentation announces the death of King Jehoshaphat. The preceding masculine verb form, however, supports the emendation of *hārinnâ* to *hārōneh,* following LXX.

V. Sirach and Dead Sea Scrolls. The root *rnn* occurs in Sirach, always in the context of praise and always as a verb: the qal in 47:10 and 50:19 (all the people rejoiced in prayer until Simon the priest finished his ministry at the altar; the object of the rejoicing is not specified), and the hiphil in 39:35 (a call to sing praises and bless the name of God).

Usage in the Dead Sea Scrolls conforms to that described in III.1 above. The occurrences of both the verb and the noun are always in joyous contexts and hence convey the sense of rejoicing. The object of the rejoicing may be Yahweh's victorious greatness (1QM 4:4; 14:2,6; 19:7; 1QH 3:23; 11:5,14,26; 1QS 10:14,17; 1QSb 2:25; cf. also 1Q30 fr. 3, 2 and 4QMᵃ[491] fr. 11, 1:9; 4QShirᵃ[510] 1:8; 4QShirᵇ[511] fr. 63, 3:1 and, reconstructed after the model of this last text, 4Q502 19:4). In 1QM 12:13,15, Zion/Jerusalem/Judah is called to rejoice over the defeat of the enemy as well as the new riches brought by the nations. The use of the root *rnn* is concentrated in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice (4QShirShabb), with 14 occurrences of the noun *rinnâ,* primarily in the plural (4Q400 fr. 2, 8; 401 fr. 14, 2:3; 403 fr. 1, 1:5(twice),9,36-37; 404 fr. 4, 4; 405 fr. 10, 1; 405 frs. 15-16, 7; 405 frs. 20-22, 8,12-13; 405 fr. 23, 1:7-8; 11QShirShabb frs. h-I, 3; 11QShirShabb 1:3). There are also 9 occurrences of the verb (4Q403 fr. 1, 1:5,36,37; 404 4:2; 405 frs. 4-5, 4; frs. 14-15, 1:3; frs. 20-22, 9,14; 25:2). In 4Q403 fr. 1, 1:4-5 and MasShirShabb 2:14, *rnn* should probably be read as a masculine noun, otherwise unattested.[32]

---

31. See III.2 above.

32. C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice. HSS* 27 (1985), 183.

The text of 1QH 5:13 is obscure; probably *wdnt* should be emended to *wrnt*.[33] Also unclear, because the context is fragmentary, are 4Q177 7:1 and 4Q504 frs. 1-2, 7:11; 504 fr. 7, 11; 6Q18 fr. 13, 3.

VI. LXX. The LXX uses a wealth of equivalents for *rnn,* especially derivatives of *agalliásthai* (concentrated in the Psalms) and *euphraínein* (concentrated in Deutero-Isaiah). The same equivalents appear in the context of lamentation as in positive contexts. No particular usage stands out.

Hausmann

33. Kuhn, 106 n. 1.

רֵעַ *rēaʿ;* רָעָה *rāʿâ* II; רֵעֶה *rēʿeh;* מֵרֵעַ *mērēaʿ;* רֵעָה *rēʿâ;* רַעְיָה *raʿyâ;* רְעוּת *rᵉʿûṯ*

I. 1. Etymology; 2. Personal Names; 3. Occurrences. II. Usage: 1. Pronominal Usage; 2. Legal Texts; 3. Proverbs; 4. Job; 5. Sirach; 6. Friend of the King; 7. Prophets. III. 1. LXX; 2. Dead Sea Scrolls.

rēaʿ. K. Berger, *Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu, I. WMANT* 40 (1972), esp. 80-257; H. Cohen "Der Nächste," *Jüdische Schriften* 1 (Berlin, 1924), 182-95; *idem,* "Die Nächstenliebe im Talmud," *ibid.,* 145-47; R. L. Cook, "The Neighbor Concept in the OT" (diss., Southern Baptist Seminary, 1980); J. Coppens, "La doctrine biblique sur l'amour de Dieu et du prochain," *ETL* 40 (1964) 252-99; H. Donner, "Der 'Freund des Königs,'" *ZAW* 73 (1961) 269-77; D. Farbstein, "Die Nächstenliebe nach jüdischer Lehre," *Jud* 5 (1949) 203-28, 241-62; A. Fernándes, "'Diliges amicum tuum sicut teipsum' (Lev 19,18)," *VD* 1 (1921) 27-28; J. Fichtner, "Der Begriff des 'Nächsten' im AT," *WuD* 4 (1955) 23-52 = *Gottes Weisheit. AzT* II/3 (1965), 88-114; E. Fuchs, "Was heisst: 'Du sollst deinen Nächsten lieben wie dich selbst'?" *Theologische Blätter* 11 (1932) 129-40; H. Greeven and J. Fichtner, "πλησίον," *TDNT,* VI, 311-18; P. Grelot, "L'Ancien Orient connaissait-il l'amour du prochain?" *Évangile* 15 (1954) 57-66; T. Hanelt, "Znaczenie terminu *rēʿa* w przykazaniu milości bliźiego Kpł 19,18b," *Roczniki Teologiczno-Kanoniczne* 19 (1972) 21-32; J. E. Hogg, "'Love Thy Neighbor,'" *AJSL* 41 (1924/25) 197f.; C. A. Keller, "Nächster, Nächstenliebe," *BHHW,* II, 1274-75; J. Kühlewein, "רֵעַ *rēaʿ* Nächster," *THAT,* II, 786-91; F. Maas, "Die Selbstliebe nach Leviticus 19,18," *FS F. Baumgärtel. Erlanger Forschungen* A/10 (1959), 109-13; H.-P. Mathys, *Liebe deinen Nächsten wie dich selbst. OBO* 71 (1986), esp. 29-39; T. N. D. Mettinger, *Solomonic State Officials. CBOT* 5 (1971), esp. 63-69; A. Nissen, *Gott und der Nächste im antiken Judentum. WUNT* 15 (1974); M. Paeslack, "Zur Bedeutungsgeschichte der Wörter φιλεῖν 'lieben,' φιλία 'Liebe,' 'Freundschaft,' φίλος 'Freund' in der Septuaginta und im NT," *Theologia Viatorum* 5 (1954) 51-142; A. Penna, "Amico del re," *RivB* 14 (1966) 459-66; G. von Rad, "Brother and Neighbor in the OT," *God at Work in Israel* (Eng. trans. Nashville, 1980), 183-93; M. Rade, "Der Nächste," *FS A. Jülicher* (1927), 70-79;

I. 1. *Etymology.* In Akkadian we find *rū'u,* "companion, friend," as well as *rū'ūtu,* "friendship."[1] The feminine form is *rūtu/ruttu,* "female companion, friend."[2] The Ugaritic occurrences are ambiguous, because the form *r'y* can be interpreted not only as *r'* with the first person singular pronominal suffix but also as the noun *r'y,* "shepherd."[3] Elsewhere we find the noun *r',* "friend, comrade,"[4] twice in parallel with *'ḫ.*[5] The expression *r' 'lm* means either "eternal friendship" or "a friend forever."[6] In a list preserving thirteen proper names,[7] each name is followed by *wr'h,* "and his comrade"; the nature of the relationship remains otherwise undefined.

For Aramaic we may cite two texts from Ahiqar. In one, where the context is missing, we find *byt r'h,* which could mean either "house of his neighbor" or "house of a shepherd."[8] The other may be interpreted as: "A sword muddies clear water [even?] between good friends[?]."[9] Cowley proposes the conjectural reading *byn r'n byn ṭbn* and translates: "A sword will trouble calm waters whether they be bad (or) good."[10] As Nöldeke has noted, however, there is no other evidence for an Aramaic word corresponding to *rēa'*; *r'yn* should therefore be understood as "shepherds," a meaning that also is consonant with water.[11]

Equally ambiguous is the only occurrence in Phoenician, in a list of temple expenditures from Kition (Cyprus) that speaks of expenditures *lr'm.*[12] The lack of context makes it impossible to determine whether the word refers to "comrades" (in the sense of temple employees) or "shepherds" (in connection with sacrificial animals).

Eth. *'ar'ūt,* "yoke," *mr'w,* "be married," and *ra'awa* are also related to Heb. *rēa'.*[13] According to Littmann, several isolated forms such as Arab. *ur'uwwa,* "yoke," Eth. *'arūt,* "yoke," and Mehri *herauwi,* "betrothed," suggest positing a stem *r'w* with basic meaning "copulate," denoting marital "union."[14] König similarly states the basic meaning to be "join, cultivate friendship or partnership, have someone as a friend."[15] The

---

A. van Selms, "The Best Man and Bride," *JNES* 9 (1950) 65-75; *idem,* "The Origin of the Title 'the King's Friend,'" *JNES* 16 (1957) 118-23; J. B. Souček, "Der Bruder und der Nächste," *Hören und Handeln. FS E. Wolf* (Munich, 1962), 362-71; C. Spicq, *Die Nächstenliebe in der Bibel. Biblische Beiträge* 3 (Einsiedeln, 1961).

1. *AHw,* II, 998.
2. *AHw,* II, 997.
3. *KTU,* 1.21, 6; 2.2, 1.
4. *KTU,* 1.22, I, 27; 5.9 (a practice text), I, 8, 10, 11.
5. *KTU,* 5.9, I, 8, 10.
6. *Ibid.,* l. 11. For the former see *WUS,* no. 2521; for the latter, *UT,* no. 2339.
7. *KTU,* 4.391.
8. Ahiqar 222.
9. Ahiqar 113; *AOT,* 459.
10. *AP,* 223, 239.
11. *AGWG, Phil.-hist. Kl.* 14 (1913), 14.
12. *KAI,* 37B.8.
13. W. Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez* (Wiesbaden, 1987), 36, 356, 459.
14. E. Littmann, *ZA* 13 (1898) 158-59.
15. König, 447.

verb, however, is very infrequent, occurring in Hebrew just three times in the qal, once in the piel, and once in the hithpael (counting Isa. 11:7 cj.); it is therefore reasonable to ask whether we should not treat it as a denominative. This approach supports the proposal that *rēaʿ* be considered a specialization of *rōʿeh:* a comrade was originally a fellow shepherd.[16] The isolated instances of *rʿ* in Aramaic and Phoenician, best interpreted as meaning "shepherd," point in the same direction. In addition, the noun *rēʿeh,* "friend," "may be simply a hybrid form created by the Masoretes" intermediate between *rōʿeh* and *rēaʿ.*[17]

2. *Personal Names.* Several personal names involve this root: *reʿû, rēʿî, reʿûʾēl,* and possibly *ʾaḥîraʿ.* The name *rʿwt,* however, probably has nothing to do with *rēaʿ.*[18] One of Peleg's sons, the father of Serug in the genealogy of Shem (Gen. 11:18-21 [P]; cf. 1 Ch. 1:25 and Lk. 3:35), is named *reʿû.* In 1 K. 1:8 a member of David's court named *rēʿî* is mentioned alongside Shimei. Here LXX^L *(kaí hoi hetaíroi autoú)* appears to have read *wrʿyw;* Josephus calls Shimei *ho Dauídou phílos* and knows nothing of any *rēʿî.*[19] According to Gen. 36:4,10,13,17, one of Esau's sons is named *reʿûʾēl.* In addition, *reʿûʾēl* is one of the three names (in addition to Jethro and Hobab) of Moses' father-in-law (Ex. 2:18); he appears as the father of Hobab in Nu. 10:29. In Nu. 2:14 the *nāśîʾ* of the tribe of Gad is named *reʿûʾēl;* in 1:14; 7:42,47; 10:20, however, he is named *deʿûʾēl.* Finally, 1 Ch. 9:8 mentions a Benjaminite named *reʿûʾēl.*

Tobit's father-in-law *Ragouēl* (Tob. 3:7; 7:1-10,13; 14:12) and the archangel Raguel (1 En. 20:4; 23:4) may also be cited in this context. If we ignore the Masoretic pointing, the name of *ʾaḥîraʿ,* the *nāśîʾ* of the tribe of Naphtali (Nu. 1:15; 2:29; 7:78,83; 10:27), probably also contains the element *rēaʿ.*[20]

Analogous anthroponyms occur in cognate languages: Akk. *i-la-ra-ḫi-ya* and *ra-ḫa-an-nu-um* (Mari);[21] Neo-Bab. *addu-raḫī;*[22] Ugar. *rʿy*[23] (which may instead mean "shepherd"[24]); Phoen. *ʿbdrʿ* and *rʿmlk;*[25] Edom. *rʿʾl;*[26] Imperial Aram. *rʿ, rʿwyh, rʿzyz, rʿy, rʿyblw, rʿyh, bytʾlrʿy, nbwrʿy, rḥmrʿ;*[27] Saf. *rʿ, rʿyʾl, rʿyt;*[28] Lihyanite *rʿy* (?),[29] *rʿw, rʿy;*[30]

16. *BLe,* §61d‴.
17. *Ibid.*
18. H. Bruppacher, *TZ* 22 (1966) 12-18.
19. *Ant.* 7.346.
20. *IPN* 16.236; for a different view see G. A. Rendsburg, *Henoch* 10 (1988) 14.
21. *APNM,* 260-61.
22. M. Weippert, *Edom* (1971), 249.
23. *PNU,* 178.408; *KTU,* 4.175, 7.
24. *UT,* no. 2340.
25. Benz, 409-10.
26. J. Naveh, *BASOR* 183 (1966) 28-30; M. Weippert, *Edom* (diss., Tübingen, 1971), 249.
27. W. Kornfeld, *Onomastica Aramaica aus Ägypten* (Vienna, 1978), 71.43.61.
28. G. L. Harding, *An Index and Concordance of Pre-Islamic Arabian Names and Inscriptions* (Toronto, 1971), 282.
29. Ryckmans, 249.
30. *Ibid.,* 202.

Palmyr. *rʿy, rʿyy'*,[31] *rʿy't;*[32] OSA *rʿym.*[33] In assessing this comparative material, we must keep in mind that *rʿ/rʿy* can mean "shepherd" as well as "friend, companion." In the case of the Phoenician and Aramaic names, the Egyptian deity Re *(rʿw)* also comes into consideration. In addition, the Aramaic examples could derive from the root *rʿy* (Arab. *rḍy,* Heb. *rṣh*), "delight in." If the element *rʿw* means "friend," the name *rʿw'l* can be interpreted as either "El is a friend" (cf. *byt'lrʿy, nbwrʿy*) or possibly "friend of El."

3. *Occurrences.* There are 187 occurrences of *rēaʿ* in the OT. This count excludes *rēaʿ* II, "noise, tumult," from → רוע *rwʿ* (Ex. 32:17; Mic. 4:9; Job 36:33), and *rēaʿ* III, "thought, intention," from *rʿh* II (Ps. 139:2,17).[34] We also find *rēaʿ* III in Prov. 20:30 cj. and possibly Job 35:4 and 16:20-21.[35] Of the 187 occurrences of *rēaʿ*, 33 are in Proverbs, 22 in Deuteronomy, 21 in Jeremiah, 20 in Exodus, 14 in Job, 8 in Zechariah, 8 in Psalms, and 7 each in Genesis and 1 Samuel. The word does not appear in Ezra, Nehemiah, Daniel, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Nahum, Zephaniah, or Haggai. As we shall see, the range of meanings extends from "companion, comrade, friend, beloved" to "neighbor" and "another."

The noun *rēʿeh,* "friend, confidant," appears 6 times: 2 S. 12:11; 15:37; 16:16; 1 K. 4:5; *K* in Prov. 3:28; 27:10. The noun *mērēaʿ,* "guest, confidant, best man," occurs 7 times (Gen. 26:26 [citing the office of *merḫum* at Mari, Safren sees here a hiphil ptcp. of *rʿh,* vocalized as *marʿēhû,* designating Ahuzzath as Abimelech's "pasturage supervisor"[36]]; Jgs. 14:11,20; 15:2,6; 2 S. 3:8; Prov. 19:7; to these occurrences we should probably add Prov. 19:4; Job 6:14;[37] and possibly Prov. 12:26). The unusual form *mērēaʿ* has been explained as a combination of *rēaʿ* and partitive *min,* with the meaning "one or more friends."[38] Another explanation derives *mērēaʿ* from a root *mrʿ* and assigns it the basic meaning "table companion, guest, one who enjoys himself."[39]

The feminine form *rēʿâ,* "(female) comrade, friend," occurs 3 times (Jgs. 11:37[*Q*],38; Ps. 45:15[Eng. 14]) as the pl. *rēʿôṯ* with a pronominal suffix.

The other feminine form, *raʿyâ,* "beloved," appears 9 times in the form of the vocative *raʿyāṯî,* "my beloved, my love," used by the bridegroom in the Song of Songs to address the bride (1:9,15; 2:2,10,13; 4:1,7; 5:2; 6:4). In Jgs. 11:37 we find *rʿyty (K).*

The feminine counterpart to *rᵉʿû,* which is found only as a personal name or as an element of one, is *rᵉʿût;* it occurs 6 times (Ex. 11:2; Isa. 34:15,16; Jer. 9:19; Zec. 11:9; Est. 1:9). It means a female "neighbor" or "another woman" in a quite general sense.

The verb *rāʿâ* II, "associate with," is very rare. The qal appears to occur 3 times in

31. *IPN,* 154, contra *PNPI,* 50.112.
32. A. Caquot, *Syr* 39 (1962) 249-50.
33. W. W. Müller, *ZAW* 75 (1963) 315.
34. L. Sabottka, *Bibl* 63 (1982) 558-59.
35. For Job 35:4 see G. Beer, *Der Text des Buches Hiob untersucht* (1897), 222; for 16:20-21, M. Dahood, *Bibl* 53 (1972) 391.
36. J. D. Safren, *ZAW* 101 (1989) 184-98.
37. F. Horst, *Hiob. BK* XVI/1 (³1983), 95, 108; for a different reading, see G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (²1989), 161.
38. J. Olshausen, *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache* (Braunschweig, 1861), §210.
39. J. Grill, *ZAW* 8 (1888) 265-79.

the form of the ptcp. *rō'eh* (Prov. 13:20; 28:7; 29:3). The LXX uses *poimaínein* to translate Prov. 28:7 and 29:3. Jgs. 14:20 uses *rē'â,* a piel form translated as "he served as his best man"; the meaning suggests a denominative from *mērēa',* "best man." A hithpael occurs in Prov. 22:24. To augment the occurrences cited in the lexicons, scholars have suggested other texts that are usually associated with *rā'â* I, such as Isa. 44:20; Hos. 9:2; 12:2(1); Job 24:1; and Prov. 15:14.[40] But it is probably more apposite to ask whether we cannot derive all the occurrences from *rā'â,* treating the various meanings as specializations of the basic meaning "tend (a flock)," since a verb *rā'â* with the meaning "associate with (someone)" is not found in any other Semitic language. Delitzsch already espoused this view when he wrote that *rā'â* "often means shelter and associate with, expanding on the concept of feeding or tending a flock."[41] If this theory is correct, the noun *rē'â* developed from *rō'eh,* and the verb *rā'â* II is simply a specialized use of *rā'â* unique to Hebrew.

II. Usage. In the OT *rēa'* originally denoted a member of one's own tribe, a confederate (cf. 1 S. 30:26), a friend ("friend of the king";[42] cf. the par. *'ōhēḇ,* e.g., in Ps. 88:19) who is like a brother (Ps. 122:8; Prov. 17:17), an acquaintance with whom one exchanges the greeting of "peace" (Ps. 28:3; 122:8; Prov. 27:14). The word refers to a neighbor (Prov. 25:17), not necessarily even an Israelite (see Ex. 3:22, where MT *wᵉšā'ᵃlâ 'iššâ miššᵉḵentâ* is modified in the Sam. text to *wš'l 'yš m't r'hw w'šh m't r'wth,* which comes from Ex. 11:2 and is associated explicitly with the Egyptians by 12:35). A "neighbor" can simply be another person (cf. Prov. 25:9, par. *'aḥēr*), who may be like a stranger (cf. Prov. 6:1, par. *zār*), but can also be a colleague (cf. Vg. of Jon. 1:7 and Job 16:22 [MT 21]) in a prophetic company (cf. 1 K. 20:35; similarly Jer. 29:23) or even a lover (Cant. 5:16; Jer. 3:1).

1. *Pronominal Usage.* The concrete meaning of *rēa'* largely vanishes when it is used pronominally in the sense of "another, someone else." It appears "with the third personal masculine singular suffix in correlation with an antecedent *'îš* (a person, a man, who . . .), with whom it is linked by a preposition or particle or by a construct phrase."[43] We often find such expressions as *'îš 'el ('eṯ/'al) rē'ēhû* or *'îš lᵉrē'ēhû* used to denote reciprocity in the sense of "one another," e.g., "and they said to one another" (Gen. 11:3), "and the people said to one another" (1 S. 10:11; in both cases *'îš 'el-rē'ēhû*), "they greeted one another" (Ex. 18:7, *'îš lᵉrē'ēhû*). Whether we are dealing with the neutral meaning "the one — the other," "each other," or a more positive sense of *rē'ēhû* often depends on interpretation of the context. For example, the expression *'š 'l r'w* in the Siloam Inscription (ll. 2-3; also *'š lqrt r'w* in l. 4) may be translated either "each toward his comrade" or "toward each."[44]

40. H. W. Wolff, *Hosea. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1974), 149; *HP,* 189-90.
41. F. Delitzsch, *BC* IV/3, 454.
42. See II.6 below.
43. Fichtner, 32.
44. For the former see *KAI,* 189; for the latter, *TUAT,* II, 555-56.

2. *Legal Texts.* The noun *rēaʿ* occurs 4 times each in the two versions of the Decalogue (Ex. 20:16,17[3 times] par. Dt. 5:20,21[3 times]), 10 times in the Covenant Code, Ex. 20:22–23:33 (21:14,18,35; 22:6,7,8,9,10,13,25[7,8,9,10,11,14,25]), 16 times in Dt. 12–28, the Dtn Code (13:7[6]; 15:2; 19:4,5[twice],11,14; 22:24,26; 23:25,26[twice][24,25]; 24:10; 27:17,24), and only 4 times in Lev. 17–26, the Holiness Code (19:13,16,18; 20:10). In these texts *rēaʿ* never denotes "someone required to obey the law, the subject of the action,"[45] but always someone to be treated as the law demands. Both the ninth commandment of the Decalogue, "Do not bear false witness against your neighbor," and the tenth, "Do not covet your neighbor's house," "define their proper scope: the *rēaʿ*, the fellow citizen, someone who lives in the neighborhood, with whom one has daily contact, i.e., the particular human community in which one is at home."[46] Here *rēaʿ* denotes a member of the social community, whose legal rights and property must be protected.

In the Covenant Code it is not entirely clear whether *rēaʿ* refers to a member of the community or simply another person. Ex. 22:9-12(10-13) deals with the situation of an animal entrusted to one's neighbor. The *rēaʿ* "generally is not responsible for the animal, neither if it dies or breaks a leg nor if it is mangled by beasts. (In the latter case, though, he must furnish evidence, a superfluous requirement in the former case.) But if the animal is stolen, restitution must be made, probably because theft of an animal could be fabricated all too easily."[47]

In Deuteronomy an individual belonging to the people of God is often called *'āḥ*. "This term alternates with *rēaʿ*, which therefore clearly acquires a different nuance than in the Covenant Code, i.e., it refers more clearly to a companion among the people of God, to whom the Israelite is linked through the covenant."[48] Dt. 15:2b is particularly illuminating: "He shall not exact it of a neighbor who is his brother [NRSV 'a member of the community']." A boundary marker of a *rēaʿ* who owns land must not be moved (Dt. 19:14; 27:17). The notion that one should love one's neighbor appears in the OT only in Lev. 19:18b. The scope of this demand is limited: "It does not look beyond the boundaries of one's own people; the 'neighbor' in v. 18a stands in parallel with 'one of your people'."[49] The commandment to love one's neighbor and its later history have been the subject of much discussion.[50]

3. *Proverbs.* The book of Proverbs uses *rēaʿ* in the sense of "friend" and also in the more general sense of "neighbor." For example, 14:20 states that the poor are disliked even by their friends, and in 27:10 we find the command: "Do not forsake your friend or the friend of your father." One's relationship with a friend is treated variously. On the

---

45. Fichtner, 36.
46. H. Gese, *Vom Sinai zum Zion. BEvT* 64 (1974), 74.
47. A. Jepsen, *Untersuchungen zum Bundesbuch. BWANT* 41 (1927), 67.
48. Fichtner, 38.
49. K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* IV (1966), 259.
50. Maas (critically reviewed by Nissen, 284); Fichtner, 38-41; Berger, 81-136; Nissen, 278-308.

one hand, a true friend sticks closer than one's brother (18:24); on the other, sometimes no distinction is made between a brother and a friend: "A friend loves at all times, as a brother he is born to share adversity" (17:17).[51] In other texts *rēaʿ* denotes simply a person in the immediate neighborhood with whom one comes in contact through shared labor or simply by chance. But such a neighbor is not treated simply as an alien or foreigner. The wisdom tradition shows special solicitude for the poor and needy. The *rēaʿ* appears in the context of giving a pledge(6:1,3; 17:18), litigation (18:17; 25:8,9), hypocritical speech (11:9), and calumny (11:12). Flattery (29:5) injures a neighbor. "With their mouths the godless would destroy their neighbors" (11:9; cf. 11:12; 27:14). In dealings with a neighbor, bearing false witness is also forbidden (24:28; 25:18). Mistreatment is castigated, whether social (3:28) or moral (disdain, 14:21; enticement, 16:29; deception, 26:19). When we read, "Do not plan harm against your *rēaʿ* who lives trustingly beside you" (3:29), and, "Make your presence [lit. 'your foot'] infrequent in the house of your *rēaʿ*" (25:17), it is clear that *rēaʿ* refers to a neighbor.

4. *Job.* The book of Job uses *rēaʿ* in the specialized sense of "friend." For example, Job's friends Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar are called *rēʿîm* by Job himself (16:20[MT]; 19:21), as well as by Elihu (32:3: "He was angry also at his [Job's] three friends"; 35:4); in the prologue: "Then Job's three friends heard of all these troubles" (2:11); in the epilogue (42:7,10). Two interpretive glosses speak of the friend who does not refuse loyalty (6:14)[52] and is not to be bargained over (6:27). According to 12:4, Job is a laughingstock to his friends; according to 30:29, he has become a companion (friend) of ostriches. The proverb in 17:5, which has been variously interpreted, probably speaks of apportioning among friends. Only in 31:9 does *rēaʿ* mean a neighbor.

In 16:20-21(MT), even God is called a friend (or partner[53]) of Job. The LXX text preserves vv. 21-22 only with an asterisk. For the Vg., Syr., and Tg., the designation of God as *rēaʿ* seemed too audacious. They therefore take the expression as referring not to God but to litigation between human beings, interpreting it as a simile (Vg.: ". . . and would that a man might so be judged with God as a son of man with his companion"). Horst maintains that 1 S. 28:17; 2 S. 12:11; and Prov. 18:17 show that *rēaʿ* can denote a "legal adversary."[54] If he is correct, then the debate occasioned by the reference to God as a friend is irrelevant.

Yahweh is likened to a friend in Ex. 33:11: "Yahweh used to speak to Moses face to face, as one speaks to a friend" *(kaʾᵃšer yᵉḏabbēr ʾîš ʾel-rēʿēhû).* This simile, found only here in the OT, emphasizes the unique relationship between Yahweh and Moses.

5. *Sirach.* In the extant Hebrew sections of Sirach, *rēaʿ* occurs 26 times. In 8 instances the Greek translation uses *plēsíon* for *rēaʿ*. The sections preserved only in Greek have an additional 18 occurrences of *plēsíon.* Sirach uses "neighbor" in a broad

51. O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos. BK* XVII (1984), 198.
52. F. Horst, *Hiob. BK* XVI/1 (^{3}1983), 107-8.
53. *Ibid.,* 240.
54. *Ibid.,* 253.

sense. This is especially clear in the Greek translation. Although Lev. 19:18b is not cited explicitly, Sir. 13:15-16 treats the love of one's neighbor. The Hebrew and Greek texts differ:

Hebrew:

All flesh loves its own kind,
and every person the one who is similar.
All flesh surrounds itself with its like,
and people associate with their like.

Greek:

Every creature loves its like,
and every person the neighbor.
All flesh associates with its own kind,
and a man sticks close to those like himself.

According to the Greek text, love of one's neighbor is like the love of an animal for members of its own species. Here the love commandment is almost like a law of nature: love of one's neighbor is born of natural desire.

In a similar vein, 18:13 says that God's love is for every living thing, whereas the compassion of human beings is limited to their neighbors. Alluding to the second portion of the Decalogue, 17:14 ("He gave commandment to each of them concerning the neighbor") establishes the proper treatment of neighbors.

Sirach puts particular emphasis on mercy and the forgiveness of neighbors: "The merciful lend to their neighbors" (29:1); "Forgive your neighbor the wrong he has done" (28:2); "Remember the commandments, and do not be angry with your neighbor" (28:7); "Assist your neighbor to the best of your ability" (29:20). Being true to one's neighbor in need means that one will also share the neighbor's prosperity (22:23). In 34(31):15, "Be aware that your neighbor is like you, and consider everything that you hate," we catch a glimpse of the golden rule.[55]

In some passages *rēaʿ* refers to a friend whose opinion can be changeable, as in 12:9: "When a man prospers, an enemy becomes a friend, but in adversity even one's friend disappears." By contrast, cf. 13:21: "When a rich person totters, he is supported by his friend."

6. *Friend of the King.* In the time of David and Solomon, the title "friend of the king" appears in the OT, in the forms *rēʿeh d̲āwid̲* (2 S. 15:37; 16:16), *rēʿeh hammelek̲* (1 K. 4:5), and *rēaʿ hammelek̲* (1 Ch. 27:33). Under David this title is given to Hushai the Archite, and under Solomon, to a man named Zabud. Van Selms interprets the "friend of the king" as a counselor in marital and family matters, whereas Penna doubts that the expression is an official title. Donner has shown that we are dealing with a bor-

55. Bab. *Shab.* 31a.

rowing of the Egyptian title *śmr wʿty,* "unique friend (of the king)," and *rḫ nśw.t,* "friend of the king." De Vaux suggests that the expression might well be a loanword from Canaanite; for in one of the Amarna Letters, Abdiḫepa, the city prince of Jerusalem, calls himself *ruḫi šarri.*[56] We do not know whether the person bearing the title also had an official function. The most likely possibility is a counselor, a kind of minister without portfolio.

The expression is understood as denoting a specific office by 1 Ch. 27:33, which lists Hushai the Archite among David's officials. The list of Solomon's officials also mentions a "friend of the king" (1 K. 4:5). According to Rüterswörden, the title refers to a kind of privy counselor who advises the king and plays an active role in safeguarding the king's dominion.[57] We may follow Donner in ascribing the desuetude of the title after David and Solomon to "its having become superfluous, because the functions of its bearer did not differ from those of a יוֹעֵץ."[58]

7. *Prophets.* The prophets vigorously condemn unjust treatment of one's neighbors. Jeremiah and Ezekiel in particular use *rēaʿ* in such contexts: Jer. 5:8: "Each neighs (like a stallion) for his neighbor's wife"; 9:7(8): "They all speak peace to their neighbors, but in their hearts are planning an ambush." The central concern is to protect the neighbor, who, for example, should not be made to work for nothing (Jer. 22:13). Ezekiel assails usury and extortion (Ezk. 22:12). The judgment to come will bring the collapse of social order. Everyone will oppress his neighbor (Isa. 3:5). A neighbor can become a source of peril through lies and slander (Jer. 9:3-4[4-5]). Therefore a neighbor is not to be trusted (Mic. 7:5).

Using the word *rēaʿ,* Hos. 3:1 and Jer. 3:1,20 insist that Israel has forsaken Yahweh like an unfaithful wife who consorts with other men. Since *rēaʿ* never refers to a husband, *ʾᵃhuḇaṯ rēaʿ* in Hos. 3:1 cannot mean "loved by her husband" (the interpretation of Tg., recently espoused by Borbone[59]); it must mean (taking *rēaʿ* collectively) "who seeks the love of others."[60] In Jer. 3:20, likewise, *mērēʿâ* does not mean "away from her husband" but "for her fornication." The image of marriage is used to represent the relationship between Yahweh and Israel. Adultery is a breach of faith (Jer. 3:20: "Just as a wife turns faithless on account of her friend, so you have been faithless to me, O house of Israel"). Israel has turned to other lovers (Jer. 3:1: "You have played the whore with many lovers"). Nevertheless, it is Yahweh's intent to make a new beginning with his people (Hos. 3:1: "Go, love a woman who seeks the love of others and is an adulteress, just as Yahweh loves the people of Israel, though they turn to other gods"[61]).

---

56. EA 288:11; de Vaux, *AncIsr,* I, 122-23.
57. U. Rüterswörden, *Die Beamten der israelitischen Königszeit. BWANT* 117 (1985), 73-77.
58. Donner, 271.
59. P. G. Borbone, *Henoch* 7 (1985) 151-59.
60. W. Rudolph, *Hosea. KAT* XIII/1 (1966), 83.
61. *Ibid.*

III. 1. *LXX.* The LXX uses *plēsíon* 112 times to translate *rēa'*. "We can only assume that it was not individual 'translators' who thought up this equivalent; it must have been current in the Jewish world of Hellenism even before the written text of the Greek OT was established. . . . The choice of this very broad term, comprehending all human beings regardless of their national and religious ties," has its theological basis "in the religious conviction of the Jewish community that, though it alone possessed God's revelation, this revelation is intended for the whole world."[62] Berger agrees and says that the choice of the simple *ho plēsíon* to represent *rēa'* should be understood "from the position of Diaspora Judaism, which wanted to make the Torah accessible to all humankind."[63] Nissen disagrees.[64]

A specialized development can be observed in the LXX of Proverbs. Of the 33 occurrences of *rēa'*, 20 are translated with *phílos* and 3 with *polítēs;* the remainder present text-critical problems in the LXX. The circle of those addressed is here restricted to friends. Probably "this translation was chosen to reflect the Greek 'ethos of friendship.'"[65] The translation *phílos* narrowed the circle of those denoted by *rēa'*; *ho plēsíon* expanded it.[66]

In addition to the use of *ho plēsíon* or *phílos* to translate *rēa'*, we also find forms of *allēl-* (3 times: Gen. 15:10; Ex. 18:7; 2 Ch. 20:23), *polítēs* (5 times: Prov. 11:9,12; 24:28; Jer. 36[29]:23; 38[31]:34), *adelphós* (twice: Gen. 43:33; Jer. 38[31]:34 LXX^{A}), and *héteros* (6 times: Gen. 31:49; Isa. 13:8; 34:14; Job 31:9; Prov. 27:17 LXX^{A}; Eccl. 4:4 LXX^{AS}). In Prov. 27:17 and Eccl. 4:4 we have a mistake caused by itacism: in both cases LXX^{B} has *hetaíros* (cf. MT Prov. 11:16), which also translates *rēa'* in 2 S. 13:3; 16:17 (twice); 1 K. 16:11 (LXX with asterisk); and Job 30:29.

The LXX also uses *hetaíros* for the "friend of the king" (2 S. 15:37 [LXX also in v. 32]; 16:16-17; 1 K. 4:5); the translator was probably thinking of the title *hetaíros* used at the Macedonian court under Philip and Alexander the Great. In 1 Ch. 27:33, the parallel to 1 K. 4:5, however, the LXX translator chooses *phílos,* obviously evincing knowledge of this title at the Ptolemaic court in Egypt.[67]

The use of *mērēa'* in the specialized sense of "best man," reflected by the translation *nymphagōgós* in Jgs. 14:20 (LXX^{A}), surfaces again without apparent reason in Gen. 26:26 and in the related LXX additions in Gen. 21:22,32. The LXX turns Ahuzzath, the adviser and friend of Abimelech of Gerar, into a "best man." The translator was presumably familiar with this specialized sense of *mērēa'* from Jgs. 14:20. Elsewhere *mērēa'* is translated *hetaíros, synétairos,* or *phílos.* The noun *rē'â* is translated *synetairís* (Jgs. 11:37,38) or *plēsíon* (Ps. 45:15[14]). The noun *ra'yāṯî* appears 9 times in the Song of Songs as a designation of the beloved; the LXX translates it with the colorless *hē plēsíon mou.* As an equivalent for *rē'ûṯ,* we find *plēsíon* 3 times and *allēl-, héteros,* and *gynḗ* once each.

62. Fichtner, 46-47.
63. Berger, 103-4.
64. Nissen, 285 n. 854.
65. Berger, 104-5; cf. Paeslack, 82.
66. Berger, 105.
67. G. Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint, I: The Book of Job. LUÅ* 1.43/3 (1946), 18.

In Gen. 38:12,20; Jer. 3:1; Prov. 22:11, the LXX finds *rōʻeh,* "shepherd," as well as in Prov. 28:7; 29:3. In Hos. 3:1; Job 17:5; Prov. 19:6, the LXX reads *raʻ,* "wicked." In Prov. 14:21 *leréhû* should be emended to *lerāʻēḇ,* following LXX. In 2 S. 3:8 LXX *gnṓrimos* is probably due to confusion of *r* with *d* (*mōḏaʻ* for *mērēaʻ*).

In the Vg. Jerome translates *rēaʻ* 75 times with *proximus* and 64 times with *amicus;* we also find isolated use of *amator, collega, frater, socius,* and *sodalis.* In Lev. 19:18 the translation *diliges amicum tuum sicut te ipsum* is tendentiously anti-Jewish, probably being assimilated secondarily to Mt. 5:44.

2. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* In the Dead Sea Scrolls *rʻ* occurs 44 times with the meaning "neighbor." Of these occurrences, 22 are in 1QS and 10 in CD; the others are 1QpHab 4:12; 1QH 4:9; 5:23; 10:28; 1Q22 3:5; 1Q27 fr. 1, 1:11; 1QSa 1:18; 1QSb 4:24; 4QM[a] fr. 11, 1:16; 11QT 54:20; 66:3,7. In most of these passages *rēaʻ* denotes a member of the Qumran community. In particular, 1QS and CD offer many examples of this usage. In 1QS 2:24 the term *rʻ* is defined unambiguously: compassionate love and upright thought are owed to the *rēaʻ,* qualified by the words "in the holy council, sons of the everlasting assembly." In CD 6:20-21 we find a free rendering of Lev. 19:18b, the primary difference being the use of *'āḥ* instead of *rēaʻ.* It is no longer the neighbor who is to be loved, but the brother. Love of one's brother replaces love of one's neighbor.

In CD 9:2-8 we find an interpretation of the prohibition against hate, vengeance, and resentment in Lev. 19:17-18a. Its beginning, "And every man of those who have entered into the covenant who brings a charge against his neighbor . . . ," shows clearly that both the person addressed and his neighbor can only be members of the Qumran community. CD 9:7-8 and 1QS 5:24-25 also cite Lev. 19:17b, although both passages surprisingly substitute *rēaʻ* for the *ʻāmîṯ* ("fellow citizen") of Leviticus. In 1QS 7:8 we also have a free quotation of Lev. 19:18a: "And whoever feels animosity toward his neighbor with no cause shall be punished for six months"; again, the *benê ʻammeḵā* are replaced by *rēaʻ.* Similarly in 7:15, "And whoever goes around defaming his neighbor," a free quotation of Lev. 19:16a, *rāḵîl beʻammeḵā* is replaced by *rkyl brʻhw.* These two passages also show clearly that at Qumran *rēaʻ* can mean only a member of the sect. A neighbor so defined is to be reproved in truth, in meekness, and in compassionate love (1QS 5:25); he is not to be interrupted (6:10; cf. 7:9), answered with a stiff neck or a hot temper (5:26), be deceived intentionally (7:5), or be complained against without a cause (7:17); no one shall appear naked before his neighbor (7:12).

Kellermann

רָעֵב *rā'ēḇ;* רָעָב *rā'āḇ;* רְעָבוֹן *r^e'āḇôn*

I. Etymology: 1. Hebrew; 2. Semitic. II. Occurrences and Usage: 1. Verb; 2. Adjective; 3. Nouns. III. Later Literature.

I. Etymology.

1. *Hebrew.* The root *r'b* appears in Hebrew as verb, noun *(rā'āḇ, r^e'āḇôn),* and adjective.

Formally, the verb groups with the "stative verbs of the *e-a* class."[1] Its syntactic and semantic usage,[2] however, suggest that it is preferable not to classify the verb *r'b* as a stative verb in the strict sense of an adjectival verb, but rather as an "action verb" with "emotional" connotations, like *yiśnā(')/śānē(').*[3] The verb appears in the qal (12 times, uniformly translated *peinán* by LXX) and hiphil (twice: Dt. 8:3 [LXX *limanchoneín*]; Prov. 10:3 [LXX *limoktoneín*]).

The noun *rā'āḇ* (101 occurrences, LXX always *limós)* belongs with the verbal nouns of the *qaṭal* type, which derive from *yiqṭal* verbs and are similarly widespread (cf. *'āmāl, śāḵār, ṣāmā', śāḇā').*[4] Consistently with this assignment, Barth and Brockelmann classify the abstract noun *r^e'āḇôn* (3 times, represented in LXX only in Ps. 37:19: *limós)* as a *qaṭalān* form, pointing out the unique preservation of the base form without the normal secondary gemination (cf. *ṣm'n).*[5] From the occurrence of

---

rā'ēḇ. G. A. Anderson, *Sacrifices and Offerings in Ancient Israel. HSM* 41 (1987), esp. 106-22; M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography X," *Bibl* 53 (1972) 386-403, esp. 391-92; A. Guillaume, "Paronomasia in the OT," *JSS* 9 (1964) 282-90; J. Guillén, "El hambre en la Biblia," *Cultura Biblica* 31 (1974) 151-56; W. L. Holladay, "Prototype and Copies," *JBL* 79 (1960) 351-67; E. Lipiński, "La parole et le pain," *Assemblées du Seigneur* 60 (1963) 40-62 = *Essais sur la Révélation et la Bible. LD* 60 (1970), 64-90; J. W. Miller, *Das Verhältnis Jeremias und Hesekiels sprachlich und theologisch untersucht* (Assen, 1955); P. D. Miller Jr., "Studies in Hebrew Word Patterns," *HTR* 73 (1980) 79-89; H. Graf Reventlow, *Wächter über Israel. BZAW* 82 (1962); T. Seidl, *Formen und Formeln in Jeremia 27–29. ATS* 5/1 (1977); 5/2 (1978), esp. 126-35; R. J. Sider, ed., *Cry Justice* (New York, 1980); P. N. Simotas, "Famine in the OT" [Greek], *Gregorios Palamas* 48 (1965), 267-71, 332-43, 399-410; W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1–25. WMANT* 41 (1973); N. J. Tromp, *Primitive Conceptions of Death and the Nether World in the OT. BietOr* 21 (1969), esp. 107-10; H. Weippert, *Die Prosareden des Jeremiabuches. BZAW* 132 (1973), esp. 148-91; H. W. Witzenrath, *Das Buch Rut. SANT* 40 (1975).

→ חרב *ḥereḇ.*

1. J. Aro, *Die Vokalisierung des Grundstamms im semitischen Verbum. StOr* 31 (1964), 11, 117-18.

2. See II.1 below.

3. W. Richter, *Grundlagen einer althebräischen Grammatik. ATS* 8, 10, 13 (1978-80), 1:70, 95-96.

4. *NSS,* 105-6; *BLe,* §61m″. On the masc. gender of *rā'āḇ* see K. Albrecht, *ZAW* 16 (1896) 103.

5. Barth, *NSS,* 336; Brockelmann, *VG,* I, 389-90; contra P. de Lagarde, *Übersicht über die im Aramäischen, Arabischen und Hebräischen übliche Bildung der Nomina AGWG* 35 (1889), 199: *qiṭalān.*

rǵbwn in Ugaritic (see below) and the replacement of *r^e'āḇôn* in Ps. 37:19 with *rā'āḇ* in 4QpPs37 2:2, Dahood concludes that *r^e'āḇôn* belongs to the early substrate of Hebrew and that the language of Ps. 37 is archaizing.[6]

The adj. *rā'ēḇ* occurs 19 times (LXX always translates with the ptcp. *peinṓn,* except in Prov. 27:7 [*endeḗs*]); it belongs to the common *qaṭil* type[7] (cf. *ṣāmē',* *śāḇēa'*).

2. *Semitic.* Heb. *r'b* has Semitic parallels only in the Northwest Semitic language of Ugarit, the Southwest Semitic language of northern Arabia, and Ethiopic and Amharic. No parallels are found in Akkadian (although von Soden notes the remarkably assonant Akk. verb *berûm,* "suffer hunger"), Canaanite (including Phoenician and Aramaic, which use *kpn/kpn'*;[8] cf. Heb. *kāp̄ān* in Job 5:22; 30:3), or Old South Arabic. In Ugaritic the verb *rǵb*[9] is used in a discourse context in the Baal myth.[10] The paronomastic expression *rǵb rǵbt* appears in what is probably a question addressed by El to the goddess Ashtart ('Aṯirat); the parallelism *ǵm'u ǵm'it* in l. 34 and the lexeme sequence *lḥm hm štym* in l. 35 support the meaning "be hungry" for *rǵb.*

The noun *r^e'āḇôn* may have a parallel in Ugar. *rǵbwn,* to which Dahood already called attention: in *KTU,* 1.103, an omen text, we find the expression *rǵbn ykn bḫwt,* "famine will be established in the land."[11] Citing this text, Herdner proposes reading *rǵbny* instead of *wǵbny* in *KTU,* 2.46, 11.[12] But we must also note the suggested reading of the noun *rǵb* with the intensive suffix *-n* in *KTU,* 1.103.[13]

In the case of the Arabic parallels *raǵiba,* "wish, desire (verb)," *raǵba,* "wish (noun)," *raǵība,* "object of desire," and *rāǵib,* "desiring,"[14] only in the verbal nouns *raǵuba, ruǵbun,* and *ruǵubun* do we find the connotation "be greedy, be a big eater," related to the Hebrew meaning of the root.

On the other hand, the Ethiopic parallels *raḫba,* "be hungry," *raḫab, raḫāb,* "hunger," and *raḫūb,* "hungry,"[15] do correspond to the semantic range of Heb. *r'b* (with dissimilation of *ǵ* > *ḫ* after *r* in Ethiopic[16]). The Amharic equivalents are *rabä,* "be hungry," and *rab,* "hunger";[17] Tigr. *räqba,* "desire vehemently," resembles Arab. *raǵiba.*[18]

---

6. Dahood, 391-92.
7. *NSS,* 12; *BLe,* §61a'''.
8. *DISO,* 125.
9. *WUS,* no. 2524.
10. *KTU,* 1.4, IV, 33.
11. *KTU,* 1.103, 3, 5, 12, 19; A. Herdner, *Ugaritica* 7 (1978) 44-60; Dahood, 391-92.
12. Herdner, *Ugaritica* 7 (1978) 59.
13. M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *Mantik in Ugarit. Abhandlungen zur Literatur Alt-Syrien-Palästinas* 3 (Münster, 1990), 108.
14. Lane, I/3, 1110-11; Wehr, 347.
15. *LexLingAeth,* 292-93; W. Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez* (Wiesbaden, 1987), 468, with other derivatives.
16. *VG,* I, 227.
17. W. Leslau, *Hebrew Cognates in Amharic* (Wiesbaden, 1969), 66, 103.
18. W. Leslau, *Ethiopic and South Arabic Contributions to the Hebrew Lexicon* (Berkeley, 1958), 50.

II. Occurrences and Usage.

1. *Verb.* The verb, which appears in the qal and hiphil, favors the qal in the disproportionate ratio of 12:2.

a. *Qal.* (1) *Syntax.* The qal of *r'b* predicates the state, condition, or occurrence of hunger. On the textual surface it appears to be used intransitively, without syntagmatic expansion in the nucleus of the clause; but Jer. 42:14 *(weʼlallehem lōʼ nir'āḇ)* shows that at the level of deep structure a prepositional object has been deleted and may be postulated as belonging to the valency of the verb. We find various subjects suffering incipient or ongoing hunger: *'ereṣ miṣrayim* (Gen. 41:55); an anonymous collective (Isa. 8:21); an indefinite subject *('îš)* in a prophetic oracle of judgment (Isa. 9:19[Eng. 20]); the returning exiles (49:10); apostates from Yahweh (65:13; note the antitheses); Jerusalem after its destruction (Jer. 42:14); typical human subjects in maxims (a thief, Prov. 6:30; an idle person, 19:15; an enemy, 25:21; a rich man[?], Ps. 34:11[10]) or comparisons (a smith, Isa. 44:12); Yahweh in a contrary-to-fact condition (Ps. 50:12). Collective personal subjects thus predominate (Gen. 41:55 may be included: abstract for concrete) as well as typical general generic terms. An individual definite subject (such as a PN) never appears as the subject of *r'b.*

Metaphorical usage of the verb (cf. Am. 8:11-12; Sir. 24:21; Mt. 5:6) is not found; it always describes a personal collective or typical individual as going without actual food.

We find negated *r'b* predicated of the returning exiles (Isa. 49:10) and a group of pro-Egyptian Jerusalemites (Jer. 42:14); the former text expresses hope for an alleviation of distress, the latter, self-assured confidence that a calamity will not come to pass.

Except in Gen. 41:55 (narrative), verbal clauses with *r'b* describe general situations and possibilities that are temporally neutral ("wisdom aphorisms") or prophesy something that will come to pass.

(2) *Semantics.* As contextual antonyms to *r'b,* we find *gzr* (Isa. 9:19[20]), *'kl* (Isa. 9:19[20]; 65:13; Prov. 25:21), *šth* (Isa. 65:13; par. *ṣm'*), *šqh* hiphil (Prov. 25:21; par. *ṣm'*), and *lōʼ ḥsr* (Ps. 34:11[10]).

In the extended lexical field of *r'b,* we find the synonyms *lōʼ śāḇa'* (Isa. 9:19[20]), *rwš* (Ps. 34:11[10]), and *y'p* (Isa. 44:12). The correlatives *r'b* + *ṣm'* ("hunger and thirst") appear in Isa. 49:10; 65:13; Prov. 25:21. As nominal parallels we find *milḥāmâ* and *qôl šôpār* (Jer. 42:14). Affective consequences of hunger are the crying *(ṣ'q)* of the people to Pharaoh (Gen. 41:55), raging (*qṣp* hithpael), and cursing (*qll,* Isa. 8:21).

In the sapiential contexts of Proverbs and Psalms, going hungry is a sign and consequence of Yahweh's absence, of apostasy, of idleness, and — paradoxically — also of wealth (metaphorical usage of *r'b?*). By contrast, the servants and followers of Yahweh do not want; they enjoy sufficient food and drink, tokens of abundance and blessing.

b. *Hiphil.* Each of the two instances of the causative of *r'b* (Dt. 8:3; Prov. 10:3) has God as its subject; the object of God's punishment is the people of Israel (Dt. 8:3) or the righteous individual (*nepeš ṣaddîq,* Prov. 10:3). In the interpretive historical retrospect of Dt. 8:3 (consecutive impf.), the hunger brought on by Yahweh is a medium of divine discipline (*'nh* piel) and instruction (*yd'* hiphil), intended to impart the knowledge that the purpose of life is not limited to the acquisition of material food but finds

fulfillment in the appropriation of all that comes from Yahweh's mouth (cf. the traditio-historical association of Dt. 8:2-3 with Am. 8:11-12[19]). The hiphil of *rʿb* is followed by the antithetical hiphil of *ʾkl,* also with God as subject, alluding to God's feeding of the Israelites with manna.

Prov. 10:3 is a maxim of empirical wisdom (impf. used to express a general truth) avowing that Yahweh does not employ hunger as a punishment afflicting the life of the righteous, whereas he thwarts *(hdp)* the craving *(hawwâ)* of the wicked.

2. *Adjective.* The adjective (19 occurrences) is rarely used attributively (3 times), but is commonly nominalized (9 times).

a. *Nominalized.* The adjective is used as a noun in both singular and plural, with and without the article, to denote the group or class of those who hunger. Together with the *reṣûṣîm,* "oppressed" (Isa. 58:6), *ʿᵃnîyîm merûḏîm,* "homeless poor" (58:7), *ʿārôm,* "naked" (58:7; Ezk. 18:7,16; Job 22:6; 24:10), *ʿᵃšûqîm,* "oppressed" (Ps. 146:7), *ʾᵃsûrîm,* "prisoners" (Ps. 146:7), and *nepeš naʿᵃnâ,* "afflicted" (Isa. 58:10), they constitute the "wretched," commended by prophetic and sapiential exhortation to the special care of the congregation. These lower classes can also include one's own kin (Isa. 58:7, *mibbeśāreḵā;* Job 22:6, *ʾaḥêḵā*).

As an antonym of the nominalized adj. *rāʿēḇ,* we find *śāḇēaʿ,* "full" (1 S. 2:5; Prov. 27:7); as a correlative, analogous to the usage of the verb, we find the adj. *ṣāmēʾ,* "thirsty" (2 S. 17:29 [but used predicatively]; Isa. 29:8; 32:6; Ps. 107:5; Job 5:5).

The Song of Hannah (1 S. 2:5) places the class of the *reʿēḇîm* in antithetical parallelism with the *śeḇēʿîm,* envisioning the former, in a reversal of the prevailing social structure, living in quiet, lasting security *(ḥdl),* while the latter have to labor for their bread *(śkr).* In the bipartite correlative similitude of Isa. 29:8, the illusionary dream of the hungry *(rāʿēḇ)* and thirsty *(ṣāmēʾ),* with the synonyms *rîq,* "empty," and *ʿāyēp,* "faint," serves to illustrate how futile are the efforts of the enemies of Jerusalem (Ariel). In the sapiential context of Isa. 32:6, a series of modal infinitives stigmatizes the misconduct of the fool *(nāḇāl),* which includes the refusal of food and drink (synonymous verbs *ryq* hiphil and *ḥsr* hiphil) to the hungry and thirsty (construct phrase with *nepeš*).

Isa. 58:5-7, a critical attack on the cult, includes the hungry along with four other groups of the downtrodden (see the synonyms above) as beneficiaries of social provisions (a series of infinitives) to mitigate their plight; this is the "fast" that Yahweh chooses. To those who offer their life (text!) to the hungry and satisfy the needs of the afflicted *(nepeš naʿᵃnâ),* the conditional statement of vv. 9-10 offers the prospect that their own need and darkness will be alleviated. In a similar vein Ezk. 18:7 and 16 describe feeding the hungry and clothing the naked as ideal conduct on the part of one who is righteous *(ṣaddîq).*

The participial praise of Yahweh in Ps. 146:7 describes him as personally distributing his benefits to the hungry, the oppressed, and prisoners.

---

19. Lipiński, 71-72.

In Job 5:5, in the first speech of Eliphaz, the correlates *rāʿēḇ* and *ṣāmēʾ* appear as instruments of punishment, despoiling the possessions of the fool *(ʾᵉwîl)*.

b. *Attributive.* Functionally, attributive usage of *rāʿēḇ* resembles its use as a noun. In Prov. 27:7 and Ps. 107:9, *rāʿēḇ* modifies the indefinite pronoun *nep̄eš*, thus establishing a generic qualification. Prov. 27:7 contrasts the relative value judgments and behaviors of the *nep̄eš śᵉḇēʿâ* and the *nep̄eš rᵉʿēḇâ*. In Ps. 107:9 Yahweh transforms into fullness the want of the *nep̄eš šōqēqâ* par. *nep̄eš rᵉʿēḇâ*. In v. 5 *rᵉʿēḇîm* and *ṣᵉmēʾîm* serve as adnominal qualifiers of Israel's (pronoun!) situation in the wilderness.

c. *Predicative.* We find *rāʿēḇ* as a predicate in both nominal clauses and *hāyâ* clauses. Examples of nominal clauses with *rāʿēḇ* are 2 S. 17:29 and 2 K. 7:12 (the latter together with the adjs. *ṣāmēʾ* and *ʿāyēp̄*); the first describes qualitatively the condition of David and the people, the second, that of the beleaguered inhabitants of Samaria.

The *hāyâ* clause in Job 18:12 is based on metaphorical usage of *rāʿēḇ*: the disaster *(ʾōn)* about to strike the wicked is given an element of menace by being described as *rāʿēḇ* (contra Tromp, who treats *ʾōn* as a verb from *ʾānâ* III, "meet," and *rāʿēḇ* as a nominalized personification of death[20]).

In the predicate of the verbal clauses in Isa. 8:21 and Job 24:10, *rāʿēḇ* functions as an adverb. In the former, an obscure text, it describes the nature and consequences of aimless wandering on the part of a debilitated group of people (Wildberger rightly rejects the proposal of Guillaume to replace *rāʿēḇ* with homonymic *rāʿîḇ*, related to Arab. *rāʿîb*, "terrified"[21]). In Job 24:10 it expresses the Tantalean torment of sinners who go hungry even while carrying the sheaves.

3. *Nouns.* a. *rāʿāḇ*. (1) *Syntax.* The noun *rāʿāḇ* occurs 101 times. It is used (a) as subject and object in verbal clauses and as subject and predicate noun in nominal clauses. At the syntactic level (b), it appears as *nomen rectum* in construct phrases, especially copulative combinations (const. adj. + *rāʿāḇ*, e.g., *ḥalᵉlê rāʿāḇ*, Lam. 4:9), as well as in prepositional phrases with *bᵉ*, *lᵉ*, *ʾel*, *min*, and *mippᵉnê*, which are inserted syntactically as circumstantial qualifiers of verbal clauses. In Jeremiah and Ezekiel these prepositional phrases are frequently expanded by inclusion of the synonyms *ḥereḇ*, *deḇer*, and *māweṯ*.

(a) When *rāʿāḇ* is the subject of a verbal clause, it appears with verbs that describe either the presence and prevalence of hunger or famine (*hāyâ*, Gen. 12:10; 26:1; 41:54,56; 42:5; 2 S. 21:1; 1 K. 8:37; 2 K. 6:25; Jer. 14:13,15; Ruth 1:1; 2 Ch. 6:28) or its approach and onset (*bôʾ*, Gen. 41:50; 2 S. 24:13; 2 Ch. 20:9; *ḥll*, Gen. 41:54; *qûm*, Gen. 41:30; *rʾh* niphal, Jer. 5:12). As a rule these more stative and inchoative clauses include a locative expression using *bāʾāreṣ* (+ toponym) or *bᵉ* + toponym localizing the condition of want; temporal expressions are also found (e.g., 2 S. 21:1, *bîmê ḏāwiḏ*). Such locative and temporal expansions appear also in verbal clauses in which verbs like *kbd* (Gen. 12:10; 43:1; 47:4,13) or *ḥzq* (Gen. 41:56,57;

20. Tromp, 109.
21. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1991), 376-77; Guillaume, 289.

47:20; 1 K. 18:2; 2 K. 25:3; Jer. 52:6) qualify or quantify the severity of the hunger. An expansion of the clause with an object designating the people and lands is found with the verbs *klh* piel (Gen. 41:30, *qr'* II (Isa. 51:19), *'kl* (Ezk. 7:15), and *dāḇaq* (+ *'aḥarê,* Jer. 42:16).

We find *rā'āḇ* used as object only in clauses with a divine subject; in such contexts it appears together with the synonyms *ḥereḇ, deḇer,* and *ḥayyâ* as a description of the punishment sent by Yahweh (preferred verb: *šlḥ* piel or hiphil: Jer. 24:10; 29:17; Ezk. 5:17; 14:13,21) — upon Zedekiah and the remnant of Jerusalem, upon Jerusalem itself, upon an unspecified land. As a synonym for *šillaḥ rā'āḇ b^e* referring to divine punishment we also find *qārā' rā'āḇ 'al* (Ps. 105:16) or *nāṯan rā'āḇ 'al* (Ezk. 36:29; positive context). Ezk. 5:16 says that Yahweh can also increase *('sp)* famine among the people. The late prophetic oracle in Am. 8:11 (from "a Dtr preacher"[22]) speaks metaphorically of Yahweh's sending (*šlḥ* hiphil) a "hunger" and "thirst" for hearing the *d^eḇar yhwh;* according to v. 12, however, this hunger and thirst will not be satisfied, a failure that spells the end of Israel as God's people.[23]

Nominal clauses with *(hā)rā'āḇ* as subject either have a locative expression in the predicate (2 K. 4:38; 7:4; Ezk. 7:15), thus corresponding functionally to verbal clauses with *hāyâ,* or establish the temporal duration (numeral + *šānâ*) of the affliction (Gen. 45:6,11; 1 Ch. 21:12).

(b) The use of *rā'āḇ* in construct phrases can also express duration (*šeḇa' š^enê rā'āḇ,* Gen. 41:27,36). More often *rā'āḇ* serves as *nomen rectum* in copulative combinations with adjectives or participles denoting destruction, injury, and want (*m^eṯê rā'āḇ,* Isa. 5:13; *taḥ^alu'ê rā'āḇ* par. *hal^elê ḥereḇ,* Jer. 14:18; *'^asupê rā'āḇ,* Ezk. 34:29; *ḥal^elê ḥereḇ* par. *ḥal^elê rā'āḇ,* Lam. 4:9; *m^ezê rā'āḇ* par. *l^eḥumê rešep,* Dt. 32:24), thus adducing the reason for the disaster that has befallen a particular group of Israelites. Substantival construct phrases emphasize the disgracefulness (*ḥerpaṯ,* Ezk. 36:30) or intensity (*zal'^apôṯ,* Lam. 5:10) of the famine or use the image of an arrow (*ḥiṣṣê rā'āḇ,* Ezk. 5:16) to describe its deadliness.

Among the prepositional phrases using *rā'āḇ,* those with *b^e* predominate. Their meaning may be instrumental, modal, causal, or temporal; they usually appear in prospective verbal clauses with verbs meaning "perish" (*krt* niphal, Gen. 41:36 [negated]; *mûṯ,* Jer. 11:22; 21:9; 27:13; 38:2; 42:17,22; 44:12; Ezk. 6:12; *tmm,* Jer. 14:15; 44:12,18,27; *klh,* Jer. 16:4; Ezk. 5:12; *ntn* niphal, Jer. 32:36; *npl,* Ezk. 6:11; *'ṭp,* Lam. 2:19) or "destroy" (*mûṯ* hiphil, Ex. 16:3; Isa. 14:30 [text!]; *klh* piel, Jer. 14:12; *ntn lāmûṯ,* 2 Ch. 32:11; *pqd,* Jer. 27:8; 44:13; *rdp,* Jer. 29:18 [the last two only a divine subject]). In these texts, mostly in prophetic literature, the instrumental-modal prepositional phrase *b^e* + *rā'āḇ* serves to flesh out threats and judgment oracles directed against such human collectives as Israel, Egypt, the inhabitants of Anathoth, Jerusalem, the Philistines, prophets, and children. Hunger — along with the sword, pestilence, and death — gives concrete form to the imminent deadly catastrophe, described

22. H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1977), 326.
23. *Ibid.,* 331; Lipiński (67ff.) calls it a "vengeful judgment."

either as a punishment ordained by Yahweh or as a well-deserved human fate. Hunger can also be a medium and token of subjugation (*ʿāḇadtā ʾeṯ-ʾōyeḇêḵā berāʿāḇ,* Dt. 28:48), along with thirst, nakedness, and lack of everything. By contrast, the few passages where *berāʿāḇ* has a temporal sense speak of Yahweh's alleviation of the scourge of famine (Job 5:20; Ps. 33:19;[24] Neh. 5:3).

The prepositional phrase *mippenê rāʿāḇ* represents a purely causal substitute for the more instrumental and modal *berāʿāḇ* (Gen. 41:31; 47:13; Jer. 14:16; 32:24; 38:9; Lam. 5:10). Used with the verbs *šʾr* niphal and *ytr* hiphil, *min rāʿāḇ* speaks of groups that have survived famine (Jer. 21:7; Ezk. 12:16). The prep. *le* with *rāʿāḇ* can introduce an indirect object in clauses with a divine subject and the verb *qrʾ* or *ntn* in the predicate; the direct object names the human group for whom Yahweh ordains or brings famine (2 K. 8:1; Jer. 18:21) or the thing that alleviates hunger (*leḥem,* Neh. 9:15). In Jer. 15:2 *lerāʿāḇ* is both a possessive in a nominal clause and a directive in a verbal clause with *hlk.* Jer. 34:17 is a special case: *ʾel rāʿāḇ* etc. denotes the resultant objective of the ironic "release"[25] proclaimed by Yahweh.

(2) *Context and Significance.* At two non-Priestly narrative points in the Abraham and Isaac traditions (Gen. 12:10; 26:1), a *rāʿāḇ* affecting the land of Canaan (cause unspecified) forces the patriarchal tribes to journey to Egypt (ch. 12) and to the land of the Philistines (ch. 26). In each case complications arise in the alien land. The causal nexus of famine and migration appears again in the story of Joseph (42:5ff.), at the beginning of the story of Ruth (Ruth 1:1),[26] and in the Elisha cycle (2 K. 8:1).

All 20 occurrences of *rāʿāḇ* in the Joseph story are in non-Priestly strata. In Gen. 41:27,30-31,36,50,54-57, *rāʿāḇ* stands in the context of Joseph's interpretation of Pharaoh's dream and the ensuing severe famine in Egypt. In 42:5 and 43:1 *rāʿāḇ* denotes the famine in Canaan that impels Joseph's brothers to travel to Egypt. In 45:6,11, the lengthy duration of the Egyptian famine is noted: two years, with five yet to come. In 47:4 Joseph's brothers inform Pharaoh that they have come to Egypt because of the famine afflicting Canaan. In 47:13,20, the severity of the famine in Egypt causes Joseph to take additional sociopolitical measures. Ps. 105:16 alludes to the famine in Canaan mentioned in the Joseph story and ascribes it to Yahweh.

There is only a single occurrence of *rāʿāḇ* in the exodus tradition: Ex. 16:3, in the story of the manna in the larger context of the Israelites' complaining in the wilderness. In the setting of a prayer, Neh. 9:15 reflects poetically on the alleviation of this hunger.

Only in Dt. 28:48, in the curses associated with the *berîṯ* in Moab, does Dtr parenesis use *rāʿāb,* in series with three additional concretions of the curse: *ṣmʾ, ʿrm,* and *ḥsr kōl.* It occurs in poetry in Dt. 32:24, also in a series of terms denoting plagues (esp. *rešep;*[27] on account of its use in parallel with *rešep,* Tromp interprets *rāʿāḇ* as a personification of death[28]).

24. Contra Tromp, 109.
25. → דרור *derôr.*
26. For a comparison of these texts and possible interdependence, see Witzenrath, 138-39.
27. Weippert, 153.
28. Tromp, 108.

We also find *rā'āḇ* in individual traditions of the Dtr History. In 2 S. 21:1-2, for example, three years of *rā'āḇ* in a row is a sign of Saul's unexpiated bloodguilt. In 24:13 *rā'āḇ* is one of the three punishments among which David must choose (the others being flight from his enemies and pestilence; the par. text in 1 Ch. 21:12 is somewhat different[29]). In Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the temple (1 K. 8:37 par. 2 Ch. 6:28), *rā'āḇ* and *deḇer* are one of several possible occasions on which the people may call upon Yahweh to hear their prayer. The Chronicler's special tradition in 2 Ch. 20:9 (Jehoshaphat's prayer) alludes to this passage in Solomon's prayer.

In the Elijah and Elisha cycles, famine appears as a central motivation for prophetic action in 1 K. 18:2 (famine in Samaria); 2 K. 4:38 (famine in Gilgal); 6:25; 7:4,12 (famine in Samaria). The conclusion of the Dtr History (2 K. 25:3 par. Jer. 52:6) speaks of *rā'āḇ* as a consequence of the siege of Jerusalem. The siege of the city by the Assyrians lies behind 2 Ch. 32:11, in a diatribe of Sennacherib that accuses Hezekiah of destroying the populace through *rā'āḇ* and *ṣāmā'*. Neh. 5:3 quotes the outcry of the ordinary people of Jerusalem, who have had to pledge their houses in order to get grain during the famine.

Except in the Joseph story, then, there are only sporadic mentions of *rā'āḇ* in the narrative traditions of the OT. Only a couple of passages (2 K. 6–7; 25) mention the siege of a city as a cause of famine; more often *rā'āḇ* appears as an abstract, almost mythic entity, always denoting an actual famine, not the habitual hunger for food.[30] In the individual passages in Deuteronomy and the Dtr History, we already note the tendency to link *rā'āḇ* with other terms denoting punishments or plagues of divine provenance, a tendency that becomes the rule in Jeremiah and Ezekiel.

In two poetic passages (Isa. 5:13 [together with *ṣāmā'*] and 14:30), *rā'āḇ* is still the sole instrument of Yahweh's deadly punishment inflicted on Israel and Philistia. In Jeremiah (32 times) and Ezekiel (16 times), however, *rā'āḇ* is associated as a rule with *ḥereḇ*, *deḇer*, and sometimes *māweṯ* and other substantives, which together constitute a stylized, formulaic series of plagues expressing God's judgment on Israel, Judah, or Jerusalem and its leaders.[31] Whether they consist of two, three, or four elements, the examples in Jeremiah and Ezekiel share several features: they appear in threats spoken by Yahweh; they are used circumstantially with verbs denoting destruction (*mûṯ*, *pqd*, *rdp*, etc.) or as objects of God's punitive visitation ("uniformly חרב, רעב, and דבר are instruments of Yahweh's punishment"[32]); and, with the exception of Jer. 27:8, the words are always addressed to Judahites of all classes.[33]

---

29. For discussion see Weippert, 173-74.

30. A point well stated already by L. Goppelt, "πεινάω," *TDNT*, VI, 14. On the mythic aspect see Anderson, 115; Tromp; Witzenrath, 81, describes the abstract noun *rā'āḇ* as indeterminate and hypostatized.

31. The order and causality of the individual elements is discussed by O. Kaiser, → V, 164-65; a formal rule for the altered sequence *ḥereḇ* — *rā'āḇ* in Jer. 14:16; 18:21 is proposed by P. D. Miller, 84-85.

32. Weippert, 168.

33. For a list of those addressed see Seidl, 2:128-29.

In Jeremiah *rā'āḇ* appears in nominal series that may be dyadic, with *ḥereḇ* (Jer. 5:12; 11:22; 14:13,15-16,18; 15:2; 16:4; 18:21; 42:16; 44:12,18,27), or triadic, with *ḥereḇ* and *deḇer* (Jer. 14:12; 21:7,9; 24:10; 27:8,13; 29:17,18; 32:24,36; 34:17; 38:2; 42:17,22; 44:13). The LXX of these series varies somewhat from the MT.[34] Holladay and Seidl generally place the dyadic series chronologically before the triadic (cf. also 2 S. 24:13 with 1 Ch. 21:12).[35] Weippert, however, is more nuanced, claiming that only in the third-party quotations in 5:12; 14:13,15 (+ 16,18); 42:16; 44:18 are the "fatalistic" dyads of pre-Jeremianic provenance; the other dyads and the triads are one and all authentic Jeremianic texts, not (as is often claimed) of Dtr origin.[36] The alternation between dyads and triads is solely stylistic: in metrical or poetic texts the dyad persists for metrical reasons; the triad is a mark of "literary prose," which tends to be expansive.[37] Apart from questions of literary analysis, it is to Weippert's credit to have demonstrated that the plague series in Jeremiah is not Dtr in origin.

For the plague triads in Jeremiah, Weippert can point to a wide range of "semantic and terminological precursors," thus refuting the view of Reventlow that the triadic formula constitutes the starting point for development of the motif.[38] According to Weippert, the development begins instead with a detailed description of all kinds of plagues, among which the three nouns in question constitute merely a semantically representative distillation. This distillation of the rhetorical material reaches its climax in Jeremiah with the appearance of the triadic form; the further development of the form after Jeremiah both decomposes it and sometimes expands it.[39] Because of its extensive prehistory, the triad cannot be a product of the late Judahite monarchy.[40] War, famine, and pestilence were in fact constant threats to people living in the ancient world, "experienced regularly by every generation." (Weippert cites ancient Near Eastern examples; Anderson goes into greater detail and notes the contrastive elements fertility/famine.[41]) The concentration on the strict triad in Jeremiah is "rather the result of a deliberate stylistic choice, which reduced the extended descriptions to their dreadful core."[42]

The subsequent development of the plague series is documented most impressively by the texts in Ezekiel. The triad still predominates (Ezk. 5:12,17; 6:11,12; 7:15; 12:16; 14:21), but its individual elements are often distributed among several syntagms or clauses (e.g., 5:17; 14:21), a phenomenon that symptomizes the gradual dissolution of the fixed triad familiar to Ezekiel. It is also possible to expand the triad by adding a fourth element, e.g., *ḥayyâ rā'â* (5:17; 14:21). (A different tetrad documents the later

34. Weippert, 150 n. 180.
35. Holladay, 361-62; Seidl, 2:126ff.
36. Seidl, 2:158ff. Cf. Thiel, 182-83.
37. Weippert, 163.
38. *Ibid.*, 149; Reventlow, 16.
39. Weippert, 178.
40. Contra J. W. Miller, 86: "battle cries."
41. Weippert, 179 n. 324; Anderson, 106-11, esp. 114.
42. Weippert, 179.

development of the plague formula in Isa. 51:19: *šōḏ šeḇer rā'āḇ ḥereḇ.*) Also characteristic of Ezekiel is the association of the plague series with the "recognition formula," as in 5:13; 6:13; 12:16,[43] so that Yahweh's punishment becomes the means through which Israel and the nations come to know God. Ezekiel resembles Jeremiah in the use of this plague series in the context of prophetic threats and oracles of judgment against Jerusalem, the land, and the house of Israel.[44]

Ezekiel is also familiar with the separate use of *rā'āḇ* for Yahweh's "arrows" and punishment (5:16; 14:13); contrariwise, Yahweh's promise to put an end to famine signifies the dawn of the new era of salvation (34:29; 36:29-30).

The noun *rā'āḇ* is rare in poetry. In Lamentations the famine in ravaged Jerusalem motivates the prayer on behalf of the starving children (2:19); the pangs of hunger are compared to the scorching heat of a furnace (5:10) and felt to be a worse hardship than death in battle (4:9). Job 5:20 speaks of death as the result of hunger, and the violence of the sword as the result of war; Yahweh will deliver the righteous from both. On the basis of Lam. 4:9 and Isa. 51:19, Kaiser suggests that the lament is a possible *Sitz im Leben* for such series of terms denoting plagues.[45]

The tendency toward abstraction and the concatenation of synonyms, already noted in prose, is intensified in prophecy and poetry: *rā'āḇ* is used almost exclusively as an abstract term representing God's punishment (even when used metaphorically in Am. 8:11); it hardly conveys any concrete sense related to a specific situation. Only a few times do we find *ṣāmā'* used as a correlative synonym (Isa. 5:13; Am. 8:11,13;[46] Dt. 28:48; Neh. 9:15; 2 Ch. 32:11; cf. Sir. 24:21). Apart from the isolated texts Isa. 8:21 and 44:12, in prophecy and poetry as well as in prose *rā'āḇ* refers not to the feeling of hunger that results from not eating but rather to the collective lack of basic sustenance (usually brought about by God) in the company of other plagues and deprivations.

b. *r^{e}'āḇôn.* The abstract noun *r^{e}'āḇôn* occurs only three times. Two of these occurrences appear in narrative discourse in the Joseph story and are related as original and quotation. In Gen. 42:19 Joseph orders his brothers to leave one behind as a hostage while the others carry grain for the famine afflicting their households and then return to Egypt with Benjamin. In abbreviated form, which may well suggest the speakers' agitation, this order is repeated in the brothers' report to their father in 42:33. The double construct phrase *šeḇer r^{e}'āḇôn bāṯêḵem* of the original is shortened by one element, leaving the zeugmatic construction *w^{e}'eṯ-r^{e}'āḇôn bāṯêḵem q^{e}ḥû.*[47] Here *r^{e}'āḇôn* denotes the general shortage of food afflicting an entire region and its people that led Joseph's brothers to go to Egypt. The collective sense of *r^{e}āḇôn* as famine, i.e., a general disaster, is also present in Ps. 37:19, as is suggested by the construct phrase introduced by

43. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1* (Eng. trans. 1979), 37, 39.
44. Seidl, 2:129.
45. → V, 165.
46. But see Wolff, *BK,* 330.
47. The interpretation of the words as a construct phrase is supported by E. König, *Syntax der hebräischen Sprache* (1897), 412; but cf. C. Westermann, *Genesis 37–50* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1986), 103, who assumes an internal object with *r^{e}'āḇôn.*

y^emê, which parallels *'ēṯ rā'â* and highlights the chronic nature of the shortage. The sapiential statements of the psalm express the paradox that the *t^emîmîm* have abundance *(śb')* in times of famine, while the *r^ešā'îm* perish. Thus we see that *r^e'āḇôn* is an abstract term reserved to denote a severe chronic lack of food, afflicting the land and its people collectively.

III. Later Literature. Texts in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs exemplify how set series of plagues including *rā'āḇ* and its equivalents survived in later Jewish literature outside the OT canon. In T. Jud. 23:3, the tetrad (cf. Ezk. 5:17) famine *(limós),* pestilence *(loimós),* death *(thánatos),* and sword *(rhomphaía)* introduces a series of fourteen divine punishments of worshiping foreign gods;[48] in T. Jos. 1:5,[49] in Joseph's survey of his life, "famine" *(limós)* is one stage in his life of suffering, along with envy, hatred, slavery, imprisonment, loneliness, sickness, and calumny.

In the Dead Sea Scrolls *r'b* appears in nominal series in benedictions and *pesharim,* which are stylistically similar to the OT. In one liturgical text ("Words of the Luminaries"), the series *ḥwlyym <r'ym> wr'b wṣm' wdbr wḥrb* (4Q504 frs. 1-2, 3:8) describes punishments sent by God throughout generations *('wtnw bšny dwrwtynw).* This text probably combines Dt. 28:48 and 28:59; the extended series in Ezk. 5:17 and Bar. 2:25 may also be cited. More frequent is the use of *r'b* in *pesharim* on Isa. 5:11ff.; Hos. 2:10ff.(8ff.); and especially Ps. 37:8ff.,19ff.: 4QpIsa^b uses the phrase *m pny hḥrb whr'b;* in 4QpHos^a 2:12 God smites *(hkm) br'b wb'rwm;* 4QpPs37 1:1 uses the classic triad *bḥrb wbr'b wbdbr* in the complement of the predicate *ywbdw;* 4QpPs37 2:2-5 interprets Ps. 37:19-20: *pšrw '[šr] yḥym br'b bmw'd h[t']wt wrbym ywbdw br'h wbdbr;* the wicked (v. 20) who suffer this fate in the psalm are identified with those who have refused to join the company of the elect *('dt bḥyrw).*

There are isolated and in part unidentified occurrences of *r'b* in 1Q42 fr. 6, 1 ([*b*]*ymy r'bwt*), 4QpIsa^c fr. 56, 1 *(r'b wnḥrw),* 4Q172 fr. 1, 2 *(b't r'bw).*

The alleged occurrence of the verb in *'l ytr'b 'yš mrṣwnw* in CD 11:4, which is claimed to prohibit fasting (!) on the sabbath, rests on a conjectural emendation of the clear grapheme sequence *yt'rb.*[50]

Seidl

---

48. Cited from M. de Jonge, *Testamenta XII Patriarchum* (Leiden, 1964), 34; on text-critical problems see J. Becker, *JSHRZ* III/1, 76; Weippert, 175.

49. Becker, 119.

50. E. Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran* (Munich, ²1971), 88; C. Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents* (Oxford, ²1958), 54-55.

רָעָה rā'â; רֹעֶה rō'eh

I. 1. Cognates; 2. Meaning. II. 1. Occurrences; LXX; 2. Shepherds and Their Equipment; 3. Breeding; 4. Music; 5. Hired Shepherds. III. 1. Metaphorical Usage; 2. Mesopotamia; 3. Egypt; 4. Greece. IV. 1. OT; 2. Verb; 3. Erotic Language; 4. Prophecy; 5. Age of Salvation. V. Subsequent Development.

I. 1. *Cognates.* The root *r'h* is Common Semitic. Apart from Hebrew, it occurs in Northwest Semitic in Imperial Aramaic,[1] Jewish Aramaic,[2] Phoenician,[3] Ugaritic,[4] and Syriac.[5] In East Semitic it occurs in Akkadian.[6] Finally, in South Semitic it occurs in Arabic,[7] Old South Arabic,[8] and Ethiopic.[9]

2. *Meaning.* The verb *rā'â* means "graze." It may be used intransitively of flocks and herds (Isa. 5:17; 11:7; 14:30; 27:10; 30:23; 65:25; Jon. 3:7; Zeph. 2:7; 3:13; Job 1:14),

---

rā'â. K.-H. Bernhardt, *Das Problem der altorientalischen Königsideologie im AT. SVT* 8 (1961); E. Bosetti, "La terminologia del pastore in Egitto e nella Bibbia," *BiOr* 26 (1984) 75-102; G. J. Botterweck, "Hirt und Herde im AT und im Alten Orient," *FS J. Frings* (Cologne, 1960), 339-52; W. H. Brownlee, "Ezekiel's Poetic Indictment of the Shepherds," *HTR* 51 (1958) 191-203; D. L. Christensen, "Anticipatory Paronomasia in Jonah 3:7-8 and Genesis 37:2," *RB* 90 (1983) 261-63; M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography X," *Bibl* 53 (1972) 386-403, esp. 392-93; G. Dalman, *AuS,* VI (1939), esp. 146-287; L. Dürr, *Ursprung und Ausbau der israelitisch-jüdischen Heilandserwartung* (Berlin, 1925), esp. 116-24; J. de Fraine, *L'aspect religieux de la royauté israélite. AnBibl* 3 (1954); A. S. Geyser, "Hirte," *BHHW,* II, 728-29; V. Hamp, "Die Hirtenmotiv im AT," *FS M. Faulhaber* (1949), 7-20; J. Jeremias, "ποιμήν," *TDNT,* VI, 485-502; W. Jost, "ΠΟΙΜΗΝ, das Bild von Hirten in der biblischen Überlieferung und seine christologische Bedeutung" (diss., Giessen, 1939); J. Kremer, *Die Hirtenallegorie im Buche Zacharias. ATA* XI/2 (1930), esp. 83-86; I. von Loewenclau, "Der göttliche Hirte im Griechentum und im AT," *ThV* 1 (1966) 30-45; V. Maag, "Der Hirte Israels," *Schweizerische theologische Umschau* 28 (1958) 2-28 = *Kultur, Kulturkontakt und Religion* (Göttingen, 1980), 111-44; D. Müller, "Der gute Hirte," *ZÄS* 86 (1961) 126-44; A. Parrot, "Le 'bon pasteur' à propos d'une statue de Mari," *FS R. Dussaud* (Paris, 1939), 171-82; A. Poebel, "Sipa(d) 'Hirte' im Sumerischen," *StOr* 1 (1925) 116-24; E. Power, "The Shepherd's Two Rods in Modern Palestine and in Some Passages of the OT," *Bibl* 9 (1928) 434-42; M. Rehm, "Die Hirtenallegorie Zach 11,4-14," *BZ* 4 (1960) 186-208; P. de Robert, *Le berger d'Israël. CTh* 57 (1968); I. Seibert, *Hirt — Herde — König* (Berlin, 1969); J. A. Soggin, "רעה *r'h* weiden," *THAT,* II, 791-94; J. G. Thomson, "The Shepherd-Ruler Concept in the OT and Its Application in the NT," *SJT* 8 (1955) 406-18; G. Wallis, "Pastor bonus," *Kairos* 12 (1970) 220-34; B. Willmes, *Die sogenannte Hirtenallegorie Ez 34. BBET* 19 (1984), with bibliog.

1. *DISO,* 281.
2. Beyer, 696.
3. *KAI,* 37B.8 (?); cf. *KAI,* II, 55; *DISO,* 281.
4. *WUS,* no. 2522; *UT,* no. 2340.
5. *LexSyr,* 737-38.
6. *AHW,* II, 976-78.
7. Wehr, 346-47.
8. Biella, 491-92; Beeston, 113.
9. *LexLingAeth,* 310-11.

usually as a metaphor representing the tranquil life of humans and animals in the peaceable kingdom to come. When the verb is used transitively, the area being grazed is added as the object: "They shall graze Bashan and Gilead" (Mic. 7:14); "the boar from the forest ravages it [the vineyard] and the animals of the field graze it (bare)" (Ps. 80:14[Eng. 13]). It may also be qualified adverbially: "They grazed in the reed grass" (Gen. 41:2,18). Except for Isa. 5:17, all these texts should probably be assigned to the later period of the biblical language.

Most often, however, when the verb is used transitively it refers to the work of the shepherd, who tends sheep and goats, more rarely cattle (Mic. 7:14) or donkeys (Gen. 36:24). Normally the object is introduced by the mark of the accusative *('eṯ)*, less often by the prep. *bᵉ* (Gen. 37:2; 1 S. 16:11). The qal active ptcp. *rō'eh*, "shepherd," generally retains its verbal force, being used with an accusative object. It may also form a construct phrase with *ṣō'n* (4 times) or *bᵉhēmâ* (twice).

II. 1. *Occurrences; LXX.* The root occurs in the qal 168 times in the OT, 82 times as the active participle. There are 8 additional occurrences in the Dead Sea Scrolls (1QH 8:8; CD 11:5; 13:9; 19:8 [twice; cf. Zec. 11:11]; 1Q34 fr. 3, 2:8; 4QDibHamᵃ frs. 1-2, 4:7; 4Q509 fr. 10, 2,3), which agree with OT usage. The LXX translates the verb 38 times with *poimaínein*, "graze, tend," 22 times with *bóskein*, "provide for," 14 times with *némein*, "put out to pasture, feed," and once each with *tréphein*, "nourish, bring up," *diṓkein*, "lead," *lymaínen*, "graze bare, lay waste" (Ps. 80:14[13]), *nomás*, "graze," and *hodēgeín*, "lead." The qal active participle is represented 65 times by *poimḗn*, 3 times by *poimanṓn*, and once each by *némōn*, *bóskōn*, and *tḗ skeúē poimeniká* (Zec. 11:15).

2. *Shepherds and Their Equipment.* The multiplicity of the Greek translations in contrast to the simple Semitic usage illustrates the variety associated with the life and work of a shepherd. The shepherd must travel with the flock (→ **עדר** *'ēḏer:* Gen. 29:2,3; 32:17[16]; Cant. 1:7; 6:5; Joel 1:18), drive it (→ **נהג** *nāhag* qal and piel; cf. Gen. 31:18; Am. 7:15), lead it by going before (→ **נחה** *nāḥâ*, usually used metaphorically), because the pasturage *(mar'îṯ* or *mir'eh)* must be as good *(ṭôḇ)* or rich *(šāmēn)* as possible, and after grazing the flock must move on. The shepherd must be very familiar with the available pastures *(nāweh)* and the routes to them. The shepherd must also be timely in leading the flock to a watering place, a permanent stream (Am. 5:24; Ps. 23:2; 74:15; Jer. 15:18), or a well *(bᵉ'ēr)* dug to provide water (Gen. 21:25,30; 26:18,19,25,32). A vivid picture of how flocks were watered is painted by the well episodes in Gen. 29:1-10 and Ex. 2:15b-16, in which women also appear.

The shepherd must also be timely in bringing the flock to a pen where they can safely spend the night, especially when the pasture is too distant to permit returning to house and stall or the encampment (Gen. 37:12-18) and the fold does not provide adequate protection. In an emergency the shepherd must keep watch over the flock in the open field (Lk. 2:8). Caves may possibly have provided shelter.[10]

---

10. Dalman, 285.

A shepherd needs appropriate equipment if he is to do the job of protecting the flock entrusted to his care against wild animals or other human beings. These included the staff (*maqqēl, miš'enet* [?]), used to control the flock, and a club (*šēbet,* Ps. 23:4; Lev. 27:32), a stick with a knob of hardened asphalt.[11] David may have used the latter to fight off wild animals (1 S. 17:35). A shepherd also needed a sling (*qelaʿ*) to confront both wild animals and robbers (1 S. 17:40,50; Sir. 47:4), as David boasts. A watchdog could also be very helpful to a shepherd (Isa. 56:10; Job 30:1).

3. *Breeding.* In addition to his other responsibilities, a shepherd also had to use careful selection to breed robust animals to provide meat, leather, and wool. The legendary stories of Jacob's profit from breeding sheep and goats (Gen. 30:30-40) eloquently reflect the expertise and craftiness of a successful shepherd.[12] The size and quality of a flock is due in large part to breeding and constitutes the wealth of the flock's owner. Here, too, years of experience and a responsiveness to the behavior of animals are of great importance. A high point in the life of shepherds is the festival of sheepshearing (1 S. 25:4,7,11), a time of happy celebration.

4. *Music.* Musical instruments were also very helpful in calming and influencing the behavior of the flock. The commonest instrument used by shepherds was the pipe (Jgs. 5:16), which sounded much like a shawm. David appears to have developed his skill in playing the pipe and the lyre (*kinnôr;* 1 S. 16:18-19,23) during the time he spent with his father's flocks. Although music may have accompanied other activities and festivities such as sheepshearing,[13] it is likely that the shepherds developed a particular pastoral style of playing.[14]

5. *Hired Shepherds.* Originally, those who possessed flocks stayed with their animals and took care of them personally, because their wealth was coterminous with the size of their flocks. Probably they tended their property with the help of their sons and sons-in-law (Abraham, Jacob with Reuben and his brothers) together with a few servants (Eliezer). Not until animals were raised commercially, as "fatstock," did flocks so increase in value that their owners entrusted their care to shepherds. As a consequence, there was now a difference between good and wicked shepherds (Zec. 11:4-17; Jn. 10:11,14; Heb. 13:20). At the very least, the repute of shepherds differed widely. Talmudic law forbids acquiring the products of animal husbandry (wool, fat, etc.) from shepherds.[15] The prestige of shepherds was undermined further by the suspicion that they were generally dishonest.

---

11. See Power.
12. → לח *laḥ.*
13. G. Wallis, *BHHW,* II, 1258-68.
14. A. Sendrey, *Music in Ancient Israel* (New York, 1969), 266-78, 477; S. Kraus, *Talmudische Archäologie,* III (Leipzig, 1912), 95.
15. Jeremias, 489.

III. 1. *Metaphorical Usage.* Along with animal husbandry, agriculture and gardening were the foundation of the people's food supply (Gen. 4:2b; Am. 7:14).[16] Game hunting is also mentioned as a source of food (Gen. 25:27). Occupations such as custodian of livestock, musician, and smith, traced to the fratricide Cain, were always somewhat suspect, since they presuppose urban settlement.

Since time immemorial, however, the occupation of shepherd has exercised immense cultural and religious influence. Since the dawn of history, the shepherd has demonstrated an affinity with the most varied occupations. He has to be familiar with land forms and soils, as well as with the settlements of a region and their history, if he is to lead his flock in timely fashion to a safe resting place with pasturage and water. Clearly his close involvement with the natural world gives him outstanding knowledge of meteorology and a sharp eye for the early signs of local storms. He also has a keen eye for danger from wild animals; he knows their nature and habits, as well as how to combat them.

The shepherd is intimately associated with the animals of his flock at all times.. They recognize him as their leader; he understands the sounds they make and responds to them effectively. If the animals can actually distinguish their own shepherd from others and he can tell them apart (Jn. 10:3-4,14), he must be endowed with wisdom, perspicacity, and empathy. On the other hand, he has to endure life under the harsh conditions of heat by day and cold by night (Gen. 31:40).

It is safe to assume that shepherds assembled collections of their personal observations and wrote poetry. It is therefore natural that the tradition placed great importance on the fact that the patriarchs,[17] as well as Moses and David, who emerged as powerful leaders of their people and shapers of their people's religion, began their careers as shepherds. In the ancient Near East, therefore, the occupation of shepherd served as a model for harsh and unyielding personalities, but also for farsighted leaders, for kings and commanders, even for gods. They distinguished themselves through their solicitude, sovereign dignity, steadfastness, and religious ardor.[18]

2. *Mesopotamia.* Drawing on the figure of the shepherd, the ancient Near East developed institutional forms that Israel — despite its affinity with shepherds and their work — adopted only with much hesitation after its coalescence as a people with a growing sense of national identity. Such an ideology appears already in early Sumerian texts.[19] Here the shepherd/monarch was also the divine bestower of the power associated with the tree of life and the water of life.[20] At the same time, he protected his people against the threat of wild animals,[21] a theme observable as late as the Neo-Assyrian period. This application of shepherd imagery to deities and kings is apparent in the

16. A. S. Kapelrud, *BHHW,* I, 22-24; Dalman, *AuS,* II, III.
17. Maag, 131-44.
18. Maag.
19. Dürr, 78-79, 117-18; Seibert, 25-27.
20. Seibert, 36.
21. *Ibid.,* 42-53.

stylized representation of staff and club along with a horned headdress as insignia of gods and kings.[22] The noun *rē'û(m),* "shepherd," comes to be used as a title (cf. Sum. *SIP*[*A*]) for someone who tends all kinds of animals — sheep, goats, donkeys, cattle, horses, and camels, not to mention poultry and even swine.[23]

The understanding of the shepherd expressed in these images is documented impressively by philological examination of the Akkadian verb *re'û(m),* "pasture, tend," and its G stem participle, which means "shepherd," as well as its nominal derivative *rē'ūtu(m),* "shepherdship, guardianship."[24] The verb also occurs with the meanings "pasture, tend cattle, keep on pasturing" (Gtn stem) and "pasture permanently" (Gt stem). Sheep and cattle are named as objects of the verb. The verb is also applied metaphorically to human beings, who are "watched over" by deities, a notion that finds expression in the formation of personal names with a theophorous element naming a god and a nontheophorous element based on the root *rē'û(m).* Kings are also described as pasturing, tending, and watching over their subjects. The qualifier "with justice" appears frequently in this context.

In court style, "shepherd" thus becomes the distinctive title of the king, who, appointed to this office, feels called to reign over the land, its towns, and its people, and faithfully to fulfill this office. Finally, even the gods are described as perceiving this as their role: they are shepherds of the whole earth, the universe, the heavens, all nations.

The noun *rē'ûtum* denotes the office of shepherd; one may be appointed to it, presented with it, or given it to exercise on behalf of higher authority. Here too the object of shepherding with justice may be animals, humans, lands, the (four quarters of the) earth.[25]

In the context of Akkadian, therefore, both the purely literal and the metaphorical meaning of "shepherd(ing)" became associated very early on with the monarchic role of the king as well as the hierarchical position of the deity within both the pantheon and the world of the nations. At the same time, this image enshrined an ideal attractive to both gods and kings, propagandizing them and reminding them of their duties.

3. *Egypt.* A similar development of the concept and image of the shepherd is also found in ancient Egypt. Although shepherds there probably did not enjoy high social esteem,[26] the metaphor was applied to Osiris and Re as early as the Old Kingdom. Despite the chaos brought on by the crisis of the First Intermediate Period (22nd-21st centuries B.C.E.), people held fast to their faith in the gods' solicitous care for human beings. Therefore the appellation did not fall into disuse at the beginning of the Middle Kingdom; instead, it became increasingly common toward the end of that period and recovered its popularity totally in the New Kingdom.

In the course of time, beginning already in the early Middle Kingdom, the image of

22. *ANEP,* nos. 439, 441, 442, 447, 534, etc.
23. *AHw,* II, 977-78.
24. Dürr, 118-20; *AHw,* II, 976-78.
25. Dürr, 20-21, 28-29; *AHw,* II, 978.
26. Müller, 130 n. 3, with bibliog.

divine shepherd begins to be joined by that of the solicitous king, who was created for the sake of the people, to whom he is also responsible.[27] According to the Code for Officials, the king is the "father of orphans, the husband of widows, the brother of the separated, the protector of the motherless."[28] In addition to the royal shepherd, beginning in the New Kingdom (Eighteenth Dynasty) we also find the high official who commands the armies described as the shepherd of those entrusted to him. The bulk of references to god and king as a shepherd are concentrated in texts of the 20th Dynasty; here the predicates "watchful" and "strong" are often added, especially in the fourteenth through twelfth centuries B.C.E., when the threat of the Libyans and the Sea Peoples demanded a king who would be "protector, shepherd, and guardian of Egypt."[29] Merneptah, for example, is called "the good shepherd *(mnyw nfr)* who keeps his army alive, father and mother to all."[30]

Behind all the texts cited here that call the pharaohs shepherds stands the declaration of devoted solicitude toward creation in the hymn to the sun god in the Instructions of Merikare (Tenth Dynasty). This notion runs through all Egyptian literature, developing in the context of unfolding cosmic universalism into the notion of the "guardian shepherd of all human beings, of all living creatures" in general.[31] The fact that the sun god played a preeminent role in Egyptian theology, like that of the god Shamash in Babylonian theology, may have played a considerable role in the hesitant and late adoption of the shepherd image in the biblical spirituality of the OT.

4. *Greece.* In ancient Greece the image of the shepherd underwent a theological and philosophical development that was quite unique, as Von Loewenclau has demonstrated impressively. The parallel Greek words *bóskein, némein,* and *poimaínein* used by the LXX to translate the Hebrew root *r'h*[32] are applied to deities in texts as early as the Homeric poems (8th century B.C.E.). On the other hand, the shepherd concept is also applied to philosophers, who as statesmen are expected to serve the best interests of those entrusted to their care, with whom, however, they have nothing in common. Here we see clearly how the meaning of the shepherd concept in the pre-Hellenistic literature of Greece differs totally from its meaning in Egypt and Mesopotamia, where the solidarity binding shepherd and people together are emphasized. This difference is also illustrated by the existence of several different words in the Greek language available to represent the complex Egyptian and Semitic shepherd concept.

IV. 1. *OT.* The OT accurately reflects the milieu of shepherds and their flocks. Only very hesitantly, however, did the OT connect the shepherd concept with the leadership

27. *Ibid.,* 132-33.
28. *Ibid.,* 131; see also H. Ranke, *ZÄS* 79 (1954) 72-73.
29. Müller, 136.
30. *Ibid.,* 137.
31. *Ibid.,* 139.
32. See II.1 above.

exercised by kings and by God. This may be because the kingship in Israel, in contrast to the monarchies of the surrounding world, was not rooted in ancient tradition and history. Possibly at the time Israel adopted kingship the title "shepherd" was already fraught with certain other notions, so that simple adoption of this allegory was problematic. There is no evidence that the term "shepherd" ever served as a title for a reigning king of Israel. The use of the term for the deity is rare or late (Gen. 48:15; Ps. 23:1 in the individual sense "my shepherd"; 80:2[Eng. 1] in the collective sense), possibly because the Israelites were aware that elsewhere in the ancient Near East the title "shepherd" was given to foreign gods, especially the sun god (Re, Shamash), a use that conflicted with its adoption by Israel. Gen. 49:24 is textually problematic and cannot be cited as evidence.[33]

2. *Verb.* The finite verb "pasture," used metaphorically, found easier entry than its nominalized participle "shepherd." When David was anointed king, he was given Yahweh's promise: "You shall pasture my people Israel, and you shall be ruler over Israel" (2 S. 5:2b par. 1 Ch. 11:2). The eschatological David, as Yahweh's agent, will do the same: "My servant David shall pasture them" (Ezk. 34:23). Ps. 78:72(71) prophesies: "With upright heart he shall pasture them and guide them with skillful hand."

The same verbal statement can have Yahweh as its subject: "On that day he will pasture them in broad pastures" (Isa. 30:23); "he will pasture his flock like a shepherd, with his arm he will gather his lambs, in his bosom he will carry them, and lead the mother sheep" (Isa. 40:11). It is clear here that the noun is introduced metaphorically because of the verbal statement, without becoming a title. In a similar way, Yahweh can speak of himself in a prophetic oracle: "And I will pasture them on the mountains of Israel, in the valleys and in all the inhabited parts of the land. With good pasture I will pasture them, and the mountain heights of Israel shall be their pasture; there they shall lie down in good grazing land, and rich pasture they shall feed upon on the mountains of Israel. I will pasture my sheep. I will make them lie down — says Yahweh the Almighty" (Ezk. 34:13b-15).

The postexilic community of Israel prays to Yahweh in these words: "Pasture your people with justice, the flock that belongs to you, which lives alone in a forest in the midst of a garden land; let them pasture in Bashan and Gilead as in the days of old" (Mic. 7:14).[34] Ps. 28:9 makes the same plea: "Save your people and bless your heritage and pasture them and carry them forever." It is striking that the concept of pasturing is frequently joined with the notion of solicitude, the real object of the people's hope. Finally, this hope can be expressed without using the language of pasturing and shepherding: "In that day — says Yahweh — I will assemble the lame and gather those who have been driven away" (Mic. 4:6). This passage, too, presupposes the experience of the exile.

---

33. See *BHS*.
34. H. Gunkel, *ZS* 2 (1924) 145-78.

3. *Erotic Language.* In its use of the imagery of pasturing, of shepherd and shepherdess, the Song of Songs takes an entirely different path. The lover pastures his sheep among the lilies (or lotus blossoms; Cant. 2:16; 4:5; 6:3), in the gardens (6:2). There his beloved seeks him as she pastures her kids (1:7) and finds him beside the shepherds' tents (1:8). Here the image of the shepherd and its related imagery appear to have entered the figurative world of "specialized erotic language."[35] Müller's theory that this usage reflects a background of nature worship must be approached with caution with respect to the Song of Songs, where it probably serves primarily as a device for the description of idyllic love.

4. *Prophecy.* The use of the nominal term for "shepherd" in language fraught with erotic symbolism is clearly a late development. It is therefore surprising that this metaphorical usage became quite important during the exilic and postexilic period in the prophets' criticism of social and political conditions. They speak primarily of "shepherds" in the plural, mostly as a metaphor for the leaders (Jer. 25:34-36) or the kings of the past. They have failed to fulfill their divine commission to pasture the people, the flock, and will therefore be visited by a just punishment (Jer. 2:8; 10:21; 12:10; 22:22; 23:4).

Shepherd terminology is used in this way in the collection of royal oracles in Jer. 23:1-3. The shepherds have failed to keep the flock together, allowing it to scatter.[36] This failure gives Yahweh reason to intervene personally and entrust the flock to new shepherds, who will pasture their flock faithfully and responsibly (v. 4). This thought is developed further in vv. 5-6, with Davidic typology that prophesies a single just and righteous king. Then the people will dwell secure.

In this use of shepherd terminology, it is clear once again that we are dealing not with a royal title from the language of the court but with a metaphor pondering the function of the king. In the future, after the people have been assembled by Yahweh, the work and function of the king will be performed by worthy agents. Thus Yahweh will open new perspectives for the people and the land (of Judah) (Jer. 31:10; 33:12; also 49:19 par. 50:44). That these passages are late additions should be undisputed.[37]

Ezekiel appropriates this message and develops it in detail in Ezk. 34. Though a single unit thematically, this chapter is formally diverse.[38] It opens with a word of Yahweh to the prophet concerning the task of the shepherds (vv. 1-2); a woe oracle declares that they have selfishly furnished themselves amply with milk, wool, and meat, but have not pastured the flock, have not strengthened the weak, have not bound up the injured, have not brought back the strayed, have not sought the lost, but have ruled them with

---

35. H.-P. Müller, → VII, 319-25.

36. W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1–25. WMANT* 41 (1973), 286, 302.

37. W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26–45. WMANT* 52 (1981), 20ff., 37.

38. On the complex textual situation see Willmes, 44-57, 181-233; G. Fohrer, *Ezechiel. HAT* XIII (1955), 191-96; W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 204-13.

force and harshness (vv. 3-4). As a result, the whole flock has scattered and become food for all the wild animals, with no one to care (vv. 5-6). There follows a second oracle of judgment against the shepherds, including Yahweh's motivation: Yahweh will demand the flock entrusted to the shepherds and dismiss them, denying them the fruits of shepherding the flock (vv. 9-10) Then Yahweh will take personal charge as shepherd, make good all the failures of the wicked shepherds, and assemble, lead, and provide for the flock (vv. 11-15).

5. *Age of Salvation.* The following prophecy of a single good shepherd in the language of Davidic typology (Ezk. 34:23-24) is probably a secondary addition inspired by Jer. 23:2-6. Here the relationship between Yahweh and the new shepherd is clarified by the statement that the latter will be Yahweh's servant and prince[39] in their midst. David will tend his flock as its one shepherd (v. 24). Here the hope for a common future for the divided kingdom coalesces with the hope for a common king and shepherd.

The same metaphor for greedy, selfish leaders of the people is also used by Trito-Isaiah (Isa. 56:11), who castigates the shepherds for neglecting the flock. They are likened to dogs that will not bark, not alert but lazy, though having mighty appetites, whose greed leads them criminally to neglect their duty.

In contrast to the wicked shepherds, the postexilic Deutero-Zechariah presents the figure of the good shepherd, driven by concern for the welfare of the flock, who must nevertheless break his two staffs "Favor" and "Unity," thus representing a wicked shepherd (Zec. 11:4-17). Meanwhile three shepherds are disposed of in a month. How this image is to be interpreted in detail is disputed. Possibly we are dealing no longer with political leaders but with spiritual leaders.[40] Finally, however, the author of the shepherd texts gives up, with an oracle of woe against the wicked shepherd who deserts his flock, thus pronouncing his own doom (v. 17).

This complex likewise includes Zec. 13:7-9, a threat pronounced against the wicked shepherd and his flock. After both have been punished harshly, a third of the flock, refined and tested, will return to Yahweh. The close entwinement of image and interpretation is central to the nature of the metaphor. It is unclear, however, what specific duties are associated here with the office of shepherd. The view that the shepherds might refer to the spiritual leaders was first voiced by the epilogue to Qoheleth: "The sayings of the wise are goads and stakes driven home as slogans. As such they are pronounced by the shepherds" (Eccl. 12:11). Thus the shepherds are the teachers who instruct their disciples.

V. Subsequent Development. In view of the scant evidence for use of the term "shepherd" as an honorific title for a political or spiritual leader, it is surprising to find it so emphasized as a term of approbation in NT literature. It is be pointed out, however, that this usage actually springs from the epithet "good shepherd," possibly be-

---

39. → נשׂיא *nāśî'*.
40. Wallis.

cause this vocational title "shepherd" was not of good omen in the early Jewish and NT period. It is important that early Jewish literature, possibly influenced by Zec. 11:4-17 and Eccl. 12:11, understood "shepherds" as leaders in the sense of teachers of the law of Israel (2 Bar. 77:13-16; 2 Esd. 5:18).[41] Moses and David were counted among such leaders.[42] Thus the early Jewish and NT period appears to have created our common understanding of the shepherd metaphor as referring to the good shepherd. Of course the OT use of the image laid the groundwork for the development of this metaphor.

Wallis

41. See also St.-B., II, 537.
42. *Ibid.*, I, 755, 972; II, 209, 536-38; etc.

רָעַם *rā'am*; רַעַם *ra'am*

I. Etymology. II. OT: 1. Occurrences; 2. Lexical Field; 3. Meaning. III. 1. LXX; 2. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Etymology. The verb *rā'am*, "thunder, roar,"[1] can hardly be associated etymologically with Akk. *ragāmu*, "call (out), bring a legal complaint," and its nominal derivative *raggimu*, "one who calls out."[2] The Akkadian nouns *ramīmu*, "roaring," *rāmimu*, "roarer" (a name for Hadad in Neo-Babylonian),[3] and finally *rimmu*, "roaring, noise" (of humans, animals, thunder, forest, etc.),[4] are semantically much closer, but the difference in radicals stands in the way of an etymological connection. At best an original (onomatopoetic?) root *r-m* is conceivable that antedates the development of the individual languages; such a root might be preserved also in Akk. *ratāmu*, "whisper," Syr. *rtm*, "murmur, speak."[5] Ugar. *rgm*, "recount, speak,"[6] is semantically remote; further-

rā'am. M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography X," *Bibl* 53 (1972) 386-403, esp. 393; J. Jeremias, *Theophanie. WMANT* 10 (²1977); J. M. Kennedy, "The Root *G'R* in the Light of Semantic Analysis," *JBL* 106 (1987) 47-64; J. Reider, "Etymological Studies in Biblical Hebrew," *VT* 2 (1952) 113-30, esp. 120-21.

1. *GesB*, 767.
2. *AHw*, II, 941-42.
3. *AHw*, II, 950.
4. *AHw*, II, 986.
5. *AHw*, II, 963.
6. *WUS*, no. 2491; *UT*, no. 2307.

more, a root *rʿm* appears to be known to Ugaritic.[7] Unrelated to this root is Heb. *rāḡam,* "stone," which is probably South Semitic in origin.

Aram. *reʿēm* means "lift," esp. "lift up one's voice, make noise," aphel "cause someone to make noise, grumble; make rebellious." The noun *raʿam/rēʿîm* means "thunder," in parallel with *zeyāʿāʾ,* "earthquake."[8] Similarly, Syr. *reʿam* means "(re)sound, glorify," ethpael "grumble, be angry."[9] In Mandaic we find *RAM/RUM* II, "thunder,"[10] and in Ethiopic, *raʿama,* "thunder."[11]

II. OT.

1. *Occurrences.* The verb (qal and hiphil) occurs 13 times in the OT and once in Sirach. Four of these occurrences are in the Psalms, 3 each in Job and 1 Samuel, and once each in 2 Samuel, Ezekiel, and 1 Chronicles. The noun *raʿam* occurs 7 times: 3 times in the Psalms, twice in Job, and once each in Isaiah and Sirach.[12] Many scholars, beginning with Lowth, have proposed emending *ywrdy* in Isa. 42:10 to *yrʿm,* a conjecture that assimilates the text to Ps. 96:11 and 98:7 and is more appropriate to the language of the context.[13] All the ancient versions, however, clearly support the MT.[14] There is no observable semantic difference in principle between the use of the verb and that of the noun.

2. *Lexical Field.* Except for the two occurrences in 1 S. 1:6 and Ezk. 27:35, *rāʿam* can clearly be categorized among the terms associated with the acoustic sphere, usually describing violent, excited reactions that may convey either rejoicing or terror.

In the psalms celebrating Yahweh's kingship, the word appears in the qal in parallel with audible expressions of joy (*rwʿ,*[15] *pāṣaḥ, māḥāʾ-yaḏ/kap,*[16] *śāmaḥ,*[17]), music (*zimmēr*[18]), rejoicing (*ʿālaz/ṣ*[19]), and singing (*rānan*[20]) (Ps. 96:11-12 = 1 Ch. 16:31-33; Ps. 98:4-8). But the noun *raʿam* can also have martial connotations when it parallels "battle cry" (*terûʿâ,* Job 39:25) or the thunder of Yahweh's mighty voice produces panic (1 S. 7:10; cf. Sir. 46:17 and also 1 S. 2:10).

Most of the occurrences, however, are in the context of a theophany or a description of creation, where *rāʿam* stands in a series of words describing various cosmic distur-

---

7. *KTU,* 1.9, 6.
8. *ChW,* II, 432; cf. *WTM,* IV, 460.
9. *LexSyr,* 739.
10. *MdD,* 421, 430.
11. *LexLingÄth,* 309.
12. On *raʿmâ* in Job 39:19, see II.3 below.
13. See *HAL,* III, 1267.
14. See the case made for emendation by K. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja. BK* XI/1 (1989), 241.
15. → רוע *rwʿ.*
16. → V, 414.
17. → שׂמח *śmḥ.*
18. → זמר *zmr.*
19. → עלז *ʿālaz.*
20. → רנן *rānan.*

bances. The noun appears in parallel with such meteorological phenomena as whirlwind (*sûpâ*,[21] *s^e'ārâ*[22]), thunder *(qôl gāḏôl)*, lightning *(lahaḇ 'ēš, gaḥ^a lê 'ēš)*, earthquake (*ra'aš*[23]), and hailstorm *(bārāḏ)* (Isa. 29:6; Ps. 18:14[Eng. 13] = 2 S. 22:14; Job 37:4-5; Ps. 77:18-19[17-18]; 104:7; Sir. 43:17).

As parallel verbs, we find *gā'ar*,[24] "rebuke" (Ps. 104:7); *šā'ag*,[25] "roar" (Job 37:4); and *nāṯan qôl*, "lift up one's voice," sometimes in the phrase *qôl ra'am* (Ps. 77:19[18]; 104:7; Sir. 43:17; Isa. 29:6). The hiphil form also appears in conjunction with *qôl* (Job 37:4,5; 40:9; in parallel: Ps. 18:14[13]; 29:3; Sir. 46:17). The only antonym found in the texts where our root appears is *šēmeṣ*, "whisper" (Job 26:14).[26]

3. *Meaning*. Except for Ezk. 27:35, the qal of *rā'am* occurs only in the psalms of Yahweh's kingship (Ps. 96:11; 98:7) and in 1 Ch. 16:32, which is dependent on Ps. 96, always in the expression *yir'am hayyām ûm^e lō'ô*, "let the sea roar, and all that fills it." Here the word is obviously intended to describe the pounding of the surf and the roaring of the breakers. The context always involves a call to praise Yahweh the king, a universal call addressed to human beings, the cosmos, and the individual works of creation. Alongside the sea, Ps. 96 = 1 Ch. 16 mentions the heavens, the earth, the field, and the trees of the forest; Ps. 98 mentions the world, the floods, and the mountains. Parallel to *rā'am* we find verbs of rejoicing. In all three texts the praise of God as king culminates in the statement that Yahweh is coming to judge the earth. The rejoicing of creation, which includes the thunder of the sea, thus accompanies a theophany bringing God's judgment.[27]

Only rarely (1 S. 1:6; Ezk. 27:35; Job 39:25; 40:9) does *rā'am* have a human subject. In 1 S. 1:6 the hiphil form describes the reaction of Peninnah when provoked by her humiliating treatment at the hands of her rival Hannah. Here the verb probably suggests something other than a loud vocal outburst, since the context says nothing of any massive verbal display of emotion against Peninnah on the part of Hannah. The context (1 S. 1:7,10) suggests instead emotional agitation, since the result is grief and depression.

In this passage Reider suggests the meaning "humiliate, abase."[28] He finds the same meaning in Ezk. 27:35, where the difficult expression *rā'^a mû pānîm* already led to emendation in the LXX (reading *w^e ḏām'û*). Once again, the context — a lament over the fall of Tyre — is significant. Those who witness the destruction of the glorious city are appalled — not gloating maliciously (v. 36 is probably secondary[29]), but with their faces contorted. In both passages *rā'am* suggests a strong display of emotional depression; *KBL*[2] therefore assigns these two instances to a separate root *r'm* II.[30]

---

21. → סופה *sûpâ*.
22. → סער *sā'ar*.
23. → רעשׁ *rā'aš*.
24. → גער *gā'ar*.
25. → שׁאג *š'g*.
26. For further discussion of the lexical field, see esp. Kennedy, 52-55.
27. Jeremias, 62, 112, 192.
28. Reider, 120-21.
29. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 55, 69.
30. *KBL*[2], 901.

In Job 39:25 the noun refers to the battle cry of the attacking captains (par. to *tᵉrûʿâ*). A few verses earlier in the passage, which describes a charger, we find the noun *raʿmâ* (v. 19), usually cited as a hapax legomenon and translated "mane." Probably because it proposes the basic meaning "move violently" for *rāʿam, BDB* thinks of the quivering mane of the horse.[31] Dahood rejects the meaning "mane, which derives from an Arabic etymology," and interprets *raʿmâ* as an archaic accusative of *raʿam.*[32] Job 40:9 denies that mortals can raise their voices like thunder, implying that only God has this ability.

We find the root much more often in association with God. The roaring of God with a mighty voice *(qôl,* 1 S. 7:10; Job 37:4-5; cf. Ps. 77:19[18]; 104:7; Sir. 43:17), especially in combination with *baššāmayim* (Ps. 18:14[13] = 2 S. 22:14; 1 S. 2:10), suggests thunder, with which Yahweh expressively accompanies his coming to intervene. In 1 S. 7:10 Yahweh's thundering *bᵉqôl-gāḏôl* resembles a battle cry before combat; the roaring of his voice in response to Samuel's sacrifice marks the beginning of his victorious battle on Israel's behalf against the Philistines (cf. Sir. 46:17). The thunder of Yahweh *baššāmayim* in 1 S. 2:10 can also be understood as a signal marking the beginning of combat (*yhwh* stands in *casus pendens; ʿlw* should be read as *ʿlyw* [*Q*][33]); the text refers not to Yahweh's intervention in battle but to his judgment of the whole earth.

In Isa. 29:6, too, *raʿam* accompanies Yahweh's intervention on behalf of his people in their battle with the enemy. Here the thunder is one element of a theophany, along with earthquake, whirlwind, tempest, and devouring fire.[34] In Ps. 18:14(13) = 2 S. 22:14, Yahweh also thunders *baššāmayim* in the context of an even more detailed description of a theophany, this time for the deliverance of an individual.

During the exodus and wandering in the wilderness, Yahweh answers his people (Ps. 81:8[7]) in the hiding place of thunder *(bᵉsēṯer raʿam),* an expression that probably stands for the presence of Yahweh. Ps. 77:19(18) uses motifs associated with theophanies to describe the exodus as Yahweh's intervention; he announces his presence with the voice of his thunder *(qôl raʿam).* Describing the work of creation, Ps. 104:7 says that the mighty waters took flight at the voice of Yahweh's thunder. In Sir. 43:17, too, the voice of Yahweh's thunder makes creation tremble. In Ps. 29:3 Yahweh's thundering (*rʿm* hiphil) parallels *qôl yhwh.* Here the context most likely suggests the actual meteorological phenomena of a thunderstorm: the passage clearly points to a theophany in a tempest. Job 37:4-5 (*qôl* in both verses) should also be read with meteorological phenomena in the background. The (overwhelming) power of God, whose voice is like thunder, is the point of 26:14, as well as of God's rhetorical question in 40:9, which asks Job whether he can thunder like God.

---

31. *BDB,* 947.

32. Dahood, 393. See *HAL,* III, 1267; cf. the discussion in M. H. Pope, *Job. AB* XV (1965), 262-63.

33. W. Gross, *Die Pendenskonstruktion im biblischen Hebräisch. ATS* 27 (1987) 154. See the discussion of the textual problems in D. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'AT. OBO* 50/1 (1982), 145.

34. For a discussion of the individual elements see Jeremias, 88-90.

III. 1. *LXX.* The LXX translates the qal of the verb twice with *saleúein* (Ps. 95[96]:11; 97[98]:7) and once each with *boán, bombeín,* and *dakrýein.* Except in 1 S. 1:6 *(athymeín),* the hiphil is translated by *brontán* (9 times, once in Sirach). For the noun the LXX uses *brontḗ* 5 times (once in Sirach), and *hálma* and *k(r)augḗ* once each.

2. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* To date, only 3 occurrences of the root have been identified in the Dead Sea Scrolls. In addition, 2 Hebrew and 2 Aramaic occurrences are expected in the unpublished texts. According to 1QH 3:34, God "thunders" in the fullness of his power; his dwelling place on high echoes the truth of his glory. When the *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* of the heavens lift their voices, the foundations of the cosmos totter (*mwg* hithpael) and tremble *(r'd).* The context of 4Q502 fr. 9, 7 is fragmentary, but to all appearances the text describes the "tumult" of certain powers of chaos praising the creator God (par. "waters of the deep"). In 11QTgJob 40:9 we are reminded of the greatness of the creator God when Job is asked: "Have you an arm like God? Or can you thunder as loud as God *('n bql kwth tr'm)*?"[35]

I. Fischer/Fabry

35. See Beyer, 297.

רַעֲנָן *ra'ᵃnān;* רען *r'n*

I. 1. Linguistic Questions; 2. Occurrences. II. Metaphorical Usage. III. The Formula *taḥaṯ kol-'ēṣ ra'ᵃnān.* IV. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. 1. *Linguistic Questions.* The substantival form *ra'ᵃnān* is not attested outside Israel.[1] Biblical Aram. *ra'nan* occurs in Dnl. 4:1(Eng. 4), and there are three occurrences

ra'ᵃnān. T. Booij, "The Hebrew Text of Psalm XCII 11," *VT* 38 (1988) 210-13; W. L. Holladay, "'On Every High Hill and under Every Green Tree,'" *VT* 11 (1961) 170-76; S. E. Loewenstamm, "An Additional Remark upon Ps 92:11b," *UF* 13 (1981) 302; *idem, "Balloti bᵉšämän ra'ᵃnān," UF* 10 (1978) 111-13; F. Lundgren, *Die Benutzung der Pflanzenwelt in der alttestamentlichen Religion. BZAW* 14 (1908); W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1–25. WMANT* 41 (1973); C. Westermann, *Vergleiche und Gleichnisse im Alten und Neuen Testament. CThM* 14 (1984); M. Zohary, *Plants of the Bible* (Eng. trans. London, 1982).
→ עץ *'ēṣ.*

1. For a discussion of the form see *GK,* §84k.

in the Midrashim.[2] In most instances *ra'ănān* is used as an adjective. The meaning "green"[3] is secondary. The word is not a primary color term,[4] and would be better translated as "fresh, luxuriant, lush, leafy." The difficulty of finding a single exact translation is already apparent in the early versions. The LXX uses seven different terms, the Vulg. five.[5] The semantic field includes *ḥāḏāš,* "new," and *ṭārî,* "fresh," as well as forms derived from the roots *dšn* and *yrq.*

2. *Occurrences.* Of the 19 occurrences in Hebrew, only Hos. 14:9(8) is clearly preexilic.[6] Of the other occurrences, 4 are in the Dtr History, 6 in Jeremiah, 1 each in Trito-Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Hosea, 4 in Psalms, and 1 each in Song of Songs and 2 Chronicles; there is also 1 occurrence in Sir. 14:18. The hapax legomenon *ra'ănānâ* appears in Job 15:32, a rare palel modification of a verb *r'n,* formed on the analogy of the Arabic IX stem;[7] in Ps. 6:3(2) *'umlal,* "be withered," an antonym to *r'n,* is another hapax legomenon formed in the same way.

II. Metaphorical Usage. The substantive is used metaphorically 11 times. In Ps. 92:15(14) and Dnl. 4:1(4) *(ra'nan),* it functions as a predicate noun. Elsewhere it is usually an attributive adjective describing a tree: Jer. 11:16; Ps. 52:10(8) → זית *zayiṯ;* Hos. 14:9(8) *berôš;* Ps. 37:35 (cj) *'erez;* Sir. 14:18 → עץ *'ēṣ;* in Jer. 17:8 it is the leaves *('āleh)* of a tree that are described. All the trees in question are distinguished by their deep green, luxuriant foliage, highly visible even at a distance amid the generally scanty vegetation of Palestine.[8] This positive connotation of *ra'ănān* can be transferred to other domains. Ps. 92:11(10), for example, speaks of the "fresh" oil[9] with which Yahweh anoints the psalmist (cf. 23:5); the orchard song (Cant. 1:16) speaks positively of the lovers' couch *('ereś)* made of fresh boughs.

Finally, Ps. 92:15(14) and Dnl. 4:1(4) use *ra'ănān* to describe a fulfilled human life. The ground is laid for this usage by texts that compare human life, especially that of the "righteous," to a tree in full vigor: Ps. 52:10(8); Jer. 11:16 (a Jeremianic oracle of judgment addressed to Judah as a whole[10]); 17:8 (vv. 5-11, a wisdom poem with strong affinities to Ps. 1); Sir. 14:18. Wisdom traditions also lie behind Ps. 37:35 and Job 15:32. The life of the wicked is a failure because they abuse or fail to attain the condition expressed by *ra'ănān,* best rendered as "fullness of life."[11]

---

2. Jastrow, 1488.
3. *GesB,* 768.
4. R. Gradwohl, *Die Farben im AT. BZAW* 83 (1963), 33 n. 50, with bibliog.; for this reason it is not treated in A. Brenner, *Colour Terms in the OT. JSOTSup* 21 (1982).
5. Gradwohl, *loc. cit.*
6. J. Jeremias, *Hosea. ATD* XXIV/1 (1983), 169-70.
7. *GK,* §55d.
8. See the illustrations in Zohary.
9. → שמן *šemen.*
10. Thiel, 155-56.
11. → XI, 274-76.

In Hosea's battle against foreign cults,[12] Hos. 14:9(8) — uniquely in the OT — likens Yahweh to a *berôš ra'anān.* Behind this oracle (vv. 4-9[3-8]), dating from shortly after 722 B.C.E.,[13] stands the common Near Eastern notion of the life-giving tree that gives shade,[14] fruit, and hence life to those who seek its shelter.[15]

III. The Formula *taḥat kol-'ēṣ ra'anān.* Echoing Hosea (Hos. 4:11-14; cf. also Isa. 57:7; 65:7; Ezk. 20:28; 34:6), the Dtr school polemicizes against cultic observances on the high places,[16] which reflect Canaanite influence. Participation in these cults has brought guilt on Israel in the eyes of Yahweh. The exile is interpreted as Yahweh's just punishment for such conduct. Besides the cultic paraphernalia appropriate to such a high place,[17] its significant feature, visible from afar, was often one or more leafy green trees of sacred character (Gen. 35:4; Josh. 24:26; etc.), under which participants in the cult gathered.

In the early period such sites were perceived as unobjectionable (1 S. 9:12; 1 K. 3:4; etc.). Later, especially in prophetic circles, there was a growing awareness that they were irreconcilable with Yahwism. The Dtr school turned this awareness into a program: according to Dt. 12:2 (Dtr[18]), the cult of the high places is a purely Canaanite phenomenon, which must be rooted out. A new formula comes into being (still unknown to Hosea), employed with minor variations to charge both Judah (1 K. 14:23) and Israel (2 K. 17:10) with idolatry. The two passages have foundational significance. Only in 2 K. 16:4 par. 2 Ch. 28:4 is a single individual, Ahaz, accused in the Dtr context of worshiping foreign gods. (The formulaic language and the homogeneity of the theme obviate the need to postulate a secondary Dtr stratum.[19])

Passages from the Dtr redaction of the book of Jeremiah, dependent on the fundamental text Dt. 12:2,[20] cite practices associated with the fertility cult performed at tree sanctuaries, whose fresh, leafy luxuriance symbolized vegetative fertility, thus exposing the guilt of Israel and Judah (Jer. 2:20; 3:6,13). Jer. 17:2 (where the formula should be restored, following the Syr.) logically connects this cult with the Asherim.[21] The oracle of judgment in Isa. 57:5 exhibits Dtr influence and is probably secondary,[22] whereas in Ezk. 6:13, in an oracle against the mountains of Israel, the prophet himself borrows Dtr language. In the exilic period, therefore, *('ēṣ) ra'anān* became a technical term for the false cult that, in the eyes of the Deuteronomists, had brought disaster on Israel.

---

12. See III below.
13. Jeremias, *ATD* XXIV/1, 169; for a different dating see H. W. Wolff, *Hosea. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1974), 234.
14. → צל *ṣēl.*
15. → XI, 272-73.
16. → במה *bāmâ, giḇ'â,* → הר *har.*
17. *AncIsr,* II, 284-88.
18. H. D. Preuss, *Deuteronomium. EdF* 164 (1982), 51.
19. Contra E. Würthwein, *Das erste Buch der Könige. ATD* XI/2 (1985), 396.
20. Thiel, 82; contra Holladay, 173-74, who considers Jer. 2:20 Jeremianic and therefore earlier.
21. → אשרה *'ašērâ; AncIsr,* II, 285-86; H. Gese, in Gese, M. Höfner, and K. Rudolph, *Die Religionen Altsyriens, Altarabiens und die Mandäer. RM* 10/2 (1970), 151.
22. B. Duhm, *Jesaja. HKAT* III/1 (^{2}1902), 387.

IV. Dead Sea Scrolls. In the Dead Sea Scrolls, 1QH 10:25 recalls the sapiential tree metaphor of Ps. 1 and Jer. 17:2.[23]

Mommer

---

23. As restored by E. Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran* (Munich, [3]1981), 151-52.

רעע *r*ʿʿ; רַע *ra*ʿ; רֹעַ *rōa*ʿ; רָעָה *rā*ʿ*â*; מֵרַע *mēra*ʿ

I. 1. Etymology and Semantics; 2. Statistics and Distribution; 3. Phrases and Idioms. II. Contexts: 1. Philosophy and Theology; 2. Religion; 3. Other Cultures. III. Thematic Foci in the OT: 1. God and Evil; 2. Human Transgressions; 3. Divine Judgment; 4. Acts and Consequences. IV. LXX. V. Dead Sea Scrolls.

---

*r*ʿʿ. G. Altner and E. Anders, eds., *Die Sünde — Das Böse — Die Schuld* (Stuttgart, 1971); J. Becker, *Das Heil Gottes. SUNT* 3 (1964); J. Bottéro, "L'Ecclésiastique et le problême du mal," *NC* 8 (1956) 133-59; G. W. Buchanan, "The OT Meaning of the Knowledge of Good and Evil," *JBL* 75 (1956) 114-20; W. Bühlmann, "Warum gerade ich?" in H. Halter, ed., *Wie böse ist das Böse?* (Zurich, 1988), 35-59; W. M. Clark, "A Legal Background to the Yahwist's Use of 'Good and Evil' in Genesis 2–3," *JBL* 88 (1969) 266-78; C. Colpe, *Das Böse* (Frankfort, 1972); J. Coppens, *La connaissance du bien et du mal et le péché du paradis. AnLov* II/3 (1948); G. I. Davies, "The Uses of *r*ʿʿ Qal and the Meaning of Jonah IV 1," *VT* 27 (1977) 105-11; C. Dohmen, *Schöpfung und Tod. SBB* 17 (1988); E. Drewermann, *Strukturen des Bösen* I-III (Munich, [6]1987); H. Duhm, *Die bösen Geister im AT* (diss., Basel, 1904); K. H. Fahlgren, "Die Gegensätze von *ṣ*ᵉ*daqā* im AT," in K. Koch, ed., *Um das Prinzip der Vergeltung in Religion und Recht des ATs. WdF* 125 (1977), 87-129; J. Fischer, "טוֹב וָרָע in der Erzählung von Paradies und Sündenfall," *BZ* 22 (1934) 323-31; A. Görres and K. Rahner, *Das Böse* (1982); R. Gordis, "The Knowledge of Good and Evil in the OT and the Qumran Scrolls," *JBL* 76 (1957) 123-38; W. Grundmann, "κακός," *TDNT,* III, 469-87; E. Haag, *Der Mensch am Anfang. TTS* 24 (1970); *idem,* "Die Ursünde und das Erbe der Gewalt im Licht der biblischen Urgeschichte," *TTZ* 98 (1989) 21-38; H. Haag, *Biblische Schöpfungslehre und kirchliche Erbsündenlehre. SBS* 10 ([4]1968); *idem,* "'Ich mache Heil und erschaffe Unheil' (Jes 45,7)" *FS J. Ziegler. FzB* 2 (1972), 179-85; *idem,* "Der 'Urstand' nach dem Zeugnis der Bible," *Das Buch des Bundes* (Düsseldorf, 1980), 159-71; *idem, Vor dem Bösen ratlos?* (Munich, [2]1989); H. Häring, "Ijob in unserer Zeit," in T. Schneider and L. Ullrich, eds., *Vorsehung und Handeln Gottes. QD* 115 (1988), 168-91; idem, *Das Problem des Bösen in der Theologie. Grundzüge* 62 (1985); G. Harder, "πονηρός, πονηρία," *TDNT,* VI, 546-66; U. Hedinger, *Erschaffen und schon gefallen? EHS* XX/21 (1976); F.-L. Hossfeld, "Die Ursünde des Menschen," *Wort und Antwort* 30 (1989) 5-11; J. B. Hygen, "Das Böse," *TRE,* VII, 8-17; H. R. Jaus, "Die Mythen vom Sündenfall (Gen 3)," *Poetik und Hermeneutik* 9 (1981) 25-35; J.-P. Jossua, "Das Böse," in P. Eicher, ed., *Neues Handbuch theologischer Grundbegriffe,* I (Munich, 1984), 119-31; O. Kaiser, "Schicksal, Leid und Gott," *FS A. H. J. Gunneweg* (1987), 30-51;

I. 1. *Etymology and Semantics.* The etymology of Heb. *r*ʿʿ remains unclear, because only a few equivalent roots occur in other Semitic languages. The attempts to connect Heb. *r*ʿʿ with Arab. *rʿrʿ*, "lower-class youth, rabble,"[1] or with Heb. *rēaʿ*[2] have not been persuasive.[3] For East Semitic, Akk. *raggu,* "bad, evil,"[4] is a (phonologically unusual)

O. Keel, *Feinde und Gottesleugner. SBM* 7 (1969); *idem, Jahwes Entgegnung an Ijob. FRLANT* 121 (1978); R. Knierim, *Die Hauptbegriffe für Sünde im AT* (Gütersloh, ²1967); K. Koch, "Gibt es ein Vergeltungsdogma im AT?" *Um das Prinzip der Vergeltung in Religion und Recht des ATs. WdF* 125 (1972), 130-80 (repr. from *ZTK* 52 [1955] 1-42); B. S. Kogan, "'Sorgt Gott sich wirklich?'" in H. H. Henrix, ed., *Unter dem Bogen des Bundes* (Aachen, 1981), 47-73; A. Kretzer, "πονηρία/πονηρός," *EDNT,* III, 134-35; M. Lattke, "κακός," *EDNT,* II, 238-39; V. Lenzen *et al.,* "Böses/Leid," in H. Waldenfels, ed., *Lexikon der Religionen* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1987), 64-72; F. Lindström and M. Limbeck, "Böse," *NBL,* 314-16; F. Lindström, *God and the Origin of Evil. CBOT* 21 (1983); C. Locher, "Jahwehs Entgegnung an Ijob," *Orientierung* 42 (1978) 238-41; N. Lohfink, "Das Böse im Herzen und Gottes Gerechtigkeit in der weiten Welt," *FS J. Sudbrack* (Würzburg, 1990), 327-41; *idem,* "Das vorpersonale Böse," *Das Jüdische am Christentum* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1987), 167-99, 264-65; K. Lorenz, *On Aggression* (Eng. trans. New York, 2002); J. L. McKenzie, *Geist und Welt des ATs* (1962), esp. 277-98; O. Marquard, "Felix culpa?" *Poetik und Hermeneutik* 9 (1981) 53-71; G. Mensching, "Das Böse," *RGG*³, I, 1343-44; G. L. Müller, "Woher kommt das Böse?" *Münchener theologische Zeitschrift* 38 (1987) 311-25; H.-P. Müller, *Das Hiobproblem. EdF* 84 (1978); T. Multhaupt, "Das Böse," in H. Cancik *et al.,* eds., *Handbuch religionswissenschaftlicher Grundbegriffe,* II (1990), 142-43; H. Muszyński, "Gott und das Böse in der Bibel," *Collectanea Theologica* 49, 23-47 = J. Reindel, ed., *Dein Wort beachten* (Leipzig, 1981), 151-79; F. Nötscher, *Gotteswege und Menschenwege in der Bibel und in Qumran. BBB* 15 (1958); *idem, Zur theologischen Terminologie der Qumran-Texte. BBB* 10 (1956); E. Noort, "JHWH und das Böse," *OTS* 23 (1984) 120-36; R. Oberforscher, *Die Flutprologe als Kompositionsschlüssel der biblischen Urgeschichte. Innsbrucker theologische Studien* 8 (1981), esp. 102-35; H. D. Preuss, "Die Frage nach dem Leid des Menschen," *FS A. H. J. Gunneweg* (Stuttgart, 1987), 52-80; R. Schnackenburg, ed., *Die Macht des Bösen und der Glaube der Kirche* (Düsseldorf, 1979); S. Schott, *Die Deutung des Rituals für die Abwehr des Bösen. AAWL(M)* (1954); R. Schwager, *Must There Be Scapegoats?* (Eng. trans. San Francisco, 1987); O. H. Steck, *Die Herkunft des Menschen* (Zurich, 1983); F. J. Stendebach, "Das Böse und der Satan," *BiKi* 30 (1975) 2-7; *idem,* "Die Frage nach Gut und Böse," *BiKi* 30 (1975) 38-41; H. S. Stern, "'The Knowledge of Good and Evil,'" *VT* 8 (1958) 405-18; H. J. Stoebe, "Gut und Böse in der Jahwistischen Quelle des Pentateuch," *ZAW* 65 (1953) 188-204 = *Geschichte, Schicksal, Schuld und Glaube. BBB* 72 (1989), 46-62; *idem,* "Sündenbewusstsein und Glaubensuniversalismus," *ThZ* 36 (1980) 197-207 = *BBB* 72 (1989), 63-73; *idem,* "רעע *r*ʿʿ schlecht sein," *THAT,* II, 794-803; L. Szondi, *Kain* (Berne, ²1978); *idem, Moses* (1973); K. van der Toorn, *Sin and Sanction in Israel and Mesopotamia. SSN* 22 (1985); W. S. Towner, *How God Deals with Evil* (Philadelphia, 1976); H. Vellmer, "Das Bösesein des Menschen und sein Freiwerden zu verantwortlicher Menschlichkeit unter dem Angebot Gottes," *FS A. H. J. Gunneweg* (1987), 224-45; S. Vierzig, *Das Böse* (Stuttgart, 1984); P. Volz, *Das Dämonische in Jahwe* (1924); N. M. Waldman, "The *dābār raʿ* of Eccl 8:3," *JBL* 98 (1979) 407-8; E.-J. Waschke, *Untersuchungen zum Menschenbild der Urgeschichte. ThArb* 43 (1984); E. Würthwein and O. Merk, *Verantwortung* (1982); E. Zenger, "'Das Blut deines Bruders schreit zu mir' (Gen 4,10)," in D. Bader, ed., *Kain und Abel* (Munich, 1983), 9-28.

1. *GesB,* 768, citing Vollers.
2. W. L. Dulière, *FS F. Altheim,* II (1970), 1-26.
3. Stoebe, *THAT,* II, 795.
4. *AHw,* II, 942; III, 1585.

equivalent to Heb. *r*ʿʿ; but, while this adjective is attested from Old Babylonian and Old Assyrian through Neo-Babylonian and Late Babylonian, the number of its occurrences is very limited. In Akkadian the semantic spectrum of Heb. *r*ʿʿ is represented by other words such as *lemēnu,* "be(come) bad, evil," *lemnu,* "bad, evil,"[5] and derivatives, or *ṣēnu* I, "evil, malicious,"[6] *ṣīnu,* "malice."[7]

In West Semitic, occurrences of *r*ʿʿ outside Biblical Hebrew are also rare. Only the Phoenician bilingual text of Karatepe (8th century B.C.E.) contains three equivalents of Heb. *r*ʿʿ: *kl hr*ʿ, "all the wickedness" (A I, 9), *ʾšm r*ʿ*m,* "wicked people" (A I, 14d), *bšʾnt wbr*ʿ, "out of hatred or wickedness" (A III, 17).[8] In Ugaritic no equivalent to Heb. *r*ʿʿ has been found to date.[9]

There is no support for the theory of a connection between the two Hebrew homonyms *r*ʿʿ I and II, in the sense that *r*ʿʿ I, "shatter, etc.," is the transitive instantiation of *r*ʿʿ II (intrans.), "be bad, evil."[10] In the OT the verb *r*ʿʿ with the meaning "smash" occurs either 5 times (Jer. 15:12; Ps. 2:9; Job 34:24; Isa. 24:19; Prov. 18:24)[11] or 14 (Isa. 8:9; 24:19 [twice]; Jer. 2:16; 11:16; 15:12; Ps. 2:9; Prov. 11:15 [twice]; 13:20; 18:24; 25:19; Job 34:24; Mic. 5:5).[12] It is clearly a by-form of the commoner West and South Semitic *rṣṣ.*[13]

Despite the obscure etymology, the semantic spectrum of *r*ʿʿ and its derivatives is well defined by its usage, especially since this usage largely coincides with the range of semantic parallels in other Semitic languages, such as Akk. *lemēnu* and Aram. *bʾš.*[14] Each of these terms covers the most varied aspects of everything not good or negative; they do not make a distinction between "bad" and "evil," and so the exact meaning of *r*ʿʿ in each instance can be determined only from contextual clues. Semantic foci come to light only in specific types of usage.[15]

Dohmen

The adj. *ra*ʿ, for example, can describe bad water (2 K. 2:19), bad figs (Jer. 24:2), or grievous boils (Dt. 28:35; Job 2:7), but also morally wicked or evil persons and actions (Gen. 6:5; 8:21; Dt. 13:6 [Eng. 5]; Ps. 5:5[4]; etc.). Nominalized *rā*ʿ*â* can also denote concrete evil or disaster (1 K. 14:10; 2 K. 21:12; Am. 3:6) as well as morally religious evil (Gen. 6:5; Isa. 57:1; Eccl. 8:6). The hiphil of the verb can mean "make (an action) evil" (1 K. 14:9; Jer. 16:12 [with *la*ʿ*ᵃśôṯ*]; Mic. 3:4 [with *ma*ʿ*ᵃlālîm*]) or, more commonly without any addition, simply "do evil" or, with *lᵉ*,

5. *AHw,* I, 542-43, 1571.
6. *AHw,* III, 1090.
7. *AHw,* III, 1103.
8. *KAI,* 26.
9. Contra *WUS,* no. 2523; cf. *UT,* no. 2606.
10. König, 449.
11. Lisowsky.
12. Even-Shoshan, with a different assignment of occurrences to *r*ʿʿ I and II.
13. → רצץ *rāṣaṣ;* cf. Beyer, 697.
14. See above.
15. See I.3 below.

"treat badly, harm" (Gen. 19:9; Nu. 16:15; Jer. 25:6; Ps. 105:15; etc.). The ptcp. *mēra'* means "evildoer."

Rick

2. *Statistics and Distribution.* The root *r''* occurs 787 times in the OT. Here, however, we shall ignore *r''* II,[16] which occurs in the OT 5 times in Hebrew and twice in Aramaic, leaving 780 occurrences of *r''* I. These represent 355 occurrences of *ra'* (about one-third of which are adjectival, two-thirds substantival), 311 of *rā'â,* 94 of the verb *r''* (qal 24, niphal 2, hiphil 68, including 18 of the ptcp.), 19 of the noun *rōa',* and 1 of *mēra'.* These various forms of the root *r''* are distributed among the biblical books as follows:

Genesis: 46	Hosea: 8	Psalms: 80
Exodus: 11	Joel: 2	Job: 16
Leviticus: 7	Amos: 7	Proverbs: 75
Numbers: 15	Obadiah: 1	Ruth: 1
Deuteronomy: 41	Jonah: 10	Song of Songs: 0
Joshua: 3	Micah: 9	Ecclesiastes: 32
Judges: 20	Nahum: 2	Lamentations: 3
1-2 Samuel: 57	Habakkuk: 3	Esther: 6
1-2 Kings: 63	Zephaniah: 2	Daniel: 4
Isaiah: 31	Haggai: 0	Ezra: 1
Jeremiah: 146	Zechariah: 6	Nehemiah: 17
Ezekiel: 23	Malachi: 3	1-2 Chronicles: 29

3. *Phrases and Idioms.* The frequent occurrence of *r''* and its derivatives in fixed phrases and idioms is significant. We find a variety of compound expressions such as *ḥayyâ rā'â,* "wild, ravening animal" (Gen. 37:20,33; Lev. 26:6; Ezk. 5:17; 14:15,21; 34:25); *(had)dāḇār (hā)rā',* "wickedness, menace, deformity, offense, etc." (Ex. 33:4; Dt. 13:12[11]; 17:1,5; 19:20; 23:10; Josh. 23:15; 2 K. 4:41; Ps. 64:6[5]; 141:4; Eccl. 8:3,5; Neh. 13:17), rarely in the plural: *d^eḇārîm rā'îm* (1 S. 2:23; 2 K. 17:11) or *diḇrê rā'* (Jer. 5:28; another reading: *d^eḇāray lārā'*[17]); *šēm ra',* "ill repute" (Dt. 22:14,19; Neh. 6:13); *rûaḥ rā'â,* "evil spirit" (Jgs. 9:23; 1 S. 16:14,15,16,23; 18:10; 19:9); *'ēṯ rā'â,* "time of trouble" (Jer. 2:27,28; 11:12; 15:11; Am. 5:13; Mic. 2:3; Ps. 37:19; Eccl. 9:12); *yôm/y^emê rā'â,* "day(s) of disaster" (Jer. 17:17,18; 51:2; Am. 6:3; Ps. 27:5; 41:2[1]; 49:6 [pl.]; 94:13 [pl.]; Prov. 16:4; Eccl. 7:14; 12:1 [pl.]); *dereḵ (hā)ra'/rā'îm,* "evil ways, misconduct" (1 K. 13:33; 2 K. 17:13; Jer. 18:11; 23:22; 25:5; 26:3; 35:15; 36:3,7; Ezk. 13:22; 20:44; 33:11; 36:31; Jon. 3:8,10; Zec. 1:4; Prov. 2:12; 4:14; 8:13; 28:10; 2 Ch. 7:14); *'îš/'āḏām rā',* "evildoer, miscreant" (1 S. 30:22; Ps. 140:2,12[1,11]; Prov. 29:6; pl.: Prov. 24:1; 28:5) (cf. also *rā'aṯ 'îš/[hā]'āḏām:* Gen. 6:5; Zec. 7:10; Eccl.

16. See I.1 above.
17. *BHS.*

8:6); *rōaʻ maʻ^a^lālîm,* "evil deeds, wickedness" (Dt. 28:20; Isa. 1:16; Jer. 4:4; 21:12; 23:2,22; 25:5; 26:3; 44:22; Hos. 9:15; Ps. 28:4) (with *raʻ* instead of *rōaʻ:* Zec. 1:4; Neh. 9:35; or *r*'' hiphil instead of *rōaʻ:* Mic. 3:4). We also find syntactically varying combinations with different meanings, such as the frequent association of the root with → לב *lēḇ* (e.g., Dt. 15:10; 1 S. 1:8; 17:28; Jer. 3:17; 7:24; 11:8; 16:12; 18:12; Ps. 28:3; 140:3[2]; Prov. 25:20; 26:23; Eccl. 9:3; Dnl. 11:27; Neh. 2:2).

The expression *biʻartā hārāʻ miqqirbeḵā,* "you shall purge the evil from your midst," appears as a legal idiom only in Deuteronomy (13:6[5]; 17:7,12; 19:19; 21:21; 22:24; 24:7);[18] the formula appears once in a narrative context, in Jgs. 20:13, the only text to describe the execution of this sentence.

The prepositional phrase *raʻ ʻayin* (Prov. 23:6; 28:22) or *raʻ b^e^ʻayin* is common in the OT; here *ʻayin* shifts by metonymy from its concrete meaning ("eye") to the abstract concept "view, opinion, judgment."[19] As an expression of displeasure and disapproval (par. to equivalent formulas using → טוב *ṭôḇ* to express approval), the phrase appears in both "secular" contexts, where it refers to a human being (Gen. 21:11,12; 28:8; 48:17; Ex. 21:8; Nu. 11:10; Dt. 28:54,56; Josh. 24:15; 1 S. 8:6; 18:8; 29:7; 2 S. 11:25; Jer. 40:4) and the emphasis is on subjective "judging by appearances,"[20] and in "theological" contexts, where it refers to God (Gen. 38:7,10; Nu. 32:13; Dt. 4:25; 9:18; 17:2; 31:29; Jgs. 2:11; 3:7,12; 4:1; 6:1; 10:6; 13:1; 1 S. 12:17; 15:19; 2 S. 11:27; 12:9; 1 K. 11:6; 14:22; 15:26,34; 16:7,19,25,30; 21:20,25; 22:53; 2 K. 3:2; 8:18,27; 13:2,11; 14:24; 15:9,18,24,28; 17:2,17; 21:2,6,15,16,20; 23:32,37; 24:9,19; Isa. 59:15; 65:12; 66:4; Jer. 7:30; 18:10; 32:30; 52:2; Mal. 2:17; Ps. 51:6[4]; Prov. 24:18; 1 Ch. 2:3; 21:17; 2 Ch. 21:6; 22:4; 29:6; 33:2,6,22; 36:5,9,12). The expression serves primarily to describe conduct that is inherently wrong both religiously and morally. It is applied uniquely to the *mal'āḵ yhwh* in the Balaam narrative (Nu. 22:34).

The most frequent use of the root is in the juxtaposition of *rāʻ* with its antonym *ṭôḇ.* The semantic spectrum of these polar terms is very broad, as is the range of their syntactic variation. The meaning of the contrast extends from a general "positive — negative" response of emotions, feelings, and sense perceptions (Gen. 24:50; 31:24,29; 50:20; 1 S. 24:18[17]; 1 K. 22:8,18; Isa. 41:23; Jer. 10:5; 32:42; 39:16; 42:6; Am. 5:14,15; 9:4; Mic. 3:2; Zeph. 1:12; Ps. 34:15[14]; 37:27; 52:5[3]; Job 2:10; 30:26; Prov. 11:27; 14:19; 15:3; 31:12; Eccl. 12:14; Lam. 3:38) to describing ethical knowledge[21] in its totality and the ability to decide between right and wrong (Gen. 2:9,17; 3:5,22; Dt. 1:39; 2 S. 19:36[35]; 1 K. 3:9; Isa. 7:15,16; Jer. 4:22). This broad semantic spectrum reflects the central significance and determinative importance of the dyad "good — evil," which characterizes fundamental modes of conduct that transcend the individual and affect the survival of the group and the well-being of the community.

A specialized use of *ṭôḇ* and *raʻ* is found in Lev. 27, in an appendix to H, where the

18. → II, 203-4.
19. E. Jenni, *THAT,* II, 264-65.
20. R. von Ungern-Sternberg, *Redeweisen der Bibel. BSt* 54 (1968), 62.
21. → ידע *yāḏaʻ.*

terms are used evaluatively in the context of settling vows and votive offerings. The text deals both with exchanging *ṭôḇ bᵉrāʿ ʾô-raʿ bᵉṭôḇ* (v. 10; cf. also v. 33) and with assessing an average value *bên ṭôḇ ûḇên rāʿ* (vv. 12,14).

In the OT the ability to distinguish cognitively between good and evil,[22] choosing the former and eschewing the latter, is a fundamental ethical requirement. But the mastery of good and evil through correct language is also of critical importance: neither evil nor good may be qualitatively reduced or even transformed into its opposite by the use of appropriate circumlocutions or descriptions. Fundamental to dealing with good and evil is their correct appellation (cf. Isa. 5:20, where a woe oracle denounces those who disguise good as evil and vice versa).

Above all, the egregious incongruity of repaying good with evil is a clear offense against ethical principles. The expression *rāʿâ taḥaṯ ṭôḇâ* used in such cases appears with the verbs *šlm* (Gen. 44:4; Jer. 18:20; Ps. 35:12; 38:21[20]), *šûḇ* (1 S. 25:21; Prov. 17:13), and *śîm* (Ps. 109:5, although the Syr. here presupposes a form of *šûḇ*[23]). In this context we shall also mention the very similar but unique expression *rāʿâ taḥaṯ rāʿâ* in Ezk. 7:5.[24] The almost apocalyptic threat expressed by this verse in the context of Ezk. 7 arises from the transformation of the traditional "retribution formula" together with the verb *bwʾ*, commonly used for God's act of judgment,[25] so that the text can be read like the necessary consequence of Jer. 9:2(3), "they proceed from evil to evil" *(mērāʿâ ʾel-rāʿâ)*.

The verbs used most often with *raʿ/rāʿâ* are → בוא *bôʾ*, "come, bring" (qal, hiphil), especially as a technical term for God's judgment; → עשׂה *ʿāśâ*, "do" (qal); → חשׁב *ḥāšaḇ*, "think, devise, plan" (qal); → דבר *dbr*, "speak" (piel); → סור *sûr*, "turn aside, depart, forsake" (qal, hiphil); and → שׁוב *šûḇ*, "turn (back), cease, avert" (qal, hiphil).

In this context the expression *rʾh bārāʿ/bārāʿâ* deserves special mention. It occurs 7 times in the OT (*bārāʿ*: Gen. 44:34; Ex. 5:19; Isa. 33:15; *bārāʿâ*, Nu. 11:15; 2 K. 22:20; Est. 8:6; 2 Ch. 34:28). Translations and commentaries do not, for the most part, appreciate the uniqueness of this construction. All the texts share the feature of dealing with an evil or a disaster that befalls someone else. In contrast to the common translation of *wayyirʾû šōṭᵉrê ḇᵉnê-yiśrāʾēl ʾōṯām bᵉrāʿ* in Ex. 5:19 as "the Israelite supervisors saw that they were in trouble," Rashi already emphasized correctly: "Then the Israelite officials saw that their comrades whom they supervised were in trouble; they saw them in trouble and in distress that was visited upon them, because they had to impose hard labor on them, saying to them, 'You shall not lessen.'"[26] Closer examination reveals the peculiarity of the construction as distinct from the expression *rʾh rāʿâ*, without a preposition (e.g., Ps. 90:15). The latter denotes not the seeing of one's own affliction or the affliction of others, but the actual suffering or experience of affliction. The construction with *bᵉ*, by contrast, establishes a certain distance — "בְּ means originally rest in a

22. See above.
23. *BHS*.
24. The textual problems are discussed by W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 195.
25. See below.
26. *Pentateuchkommentar*, trans. ed. S. Bamberger (Frankfort, ³1975), 151.

place; it is then extended to indicate motion toward a goal. . . . Then follows the use of בְּ after verbs that do not affect their object directly, but simply touch upon it."[27] The effect of this distance is that the viewer sees the evil afflicting others but does not experience it personally; we are dealing with a kind of indirect involvement. The conclusion reached by this analysis is quite clear in passages such as Gen. 44:34; 2 K. 22:20 par. 2 Ch. 34:28; Est. 8:6; Ex. 5:19. Only in Isa. 33:15 does this reading appear odd:

> Those who walk righteously and speak uprightly,
> who despise the gain of oppression,
> who wave away a bribe instead of accepting it,
> who stop their ears from hearing of bloodshed,
> and shut their eyes from looking on evil. . . .

The expression *mēr'ôṯ bᵉrā'* in the last line is interpreted by Wildberger and others to mean shutting one's eyes "so as not to dwell on wicked matters."[28] In the context of the other passages using this construction, however, it makes more sense to think in terms of total distancing from evil and/or the afflictions of others. Kaiser's dating of Isa. 33 in the Hellenistic period makes this almost stoic attitude both understandable and reasonable.[29]

Finally, Nu. 11:15 also merits special attention. In the final portion of the verse, *wᵉ'al-'er'eh bᵉrā'ṯî, BHS* and *BHK* indicate that the last word is a *tiqqun sopherim* replacing an original *bᵉrā'āṯêḵā*. Closer examination, however, shows that Jewish tradition is not unequivocal concerning the *tiqqun* in this passage: some sources give *bᵉrā'āṯām* as the original reading instead of *bᵉrā'āṯêḵā*.[30] While the reading of the MT is out of the question in light of the construction under discussion, both "original readings" are unexceptionable from this perspective. In v. 15, arguing with God about the querulous Israelites, Moses proposes two alternatives: either God continues to burden him with bearing the grumbling of the people, in which case he does not want to go on living, or God has pity on him (the alternatives in v. 15 echo v. 11, where both possibilities have already been mentioned, and are to be understood in the light of the earlier verse) and no longer forces him to see the affliction or evil of the people (or of God). The solution to the problem of the two readings in the final portion of v. 15 depends in large measure on the semantics of *rā'â:* it can refer to either the destruction of the people or the disaster inflicted by God to punish them. Common to all the variants is Moses' distance from the people when he speaks in his function as mediator. In the context of Nu. 11, this very fact may have evoked the "correction of the MT," since some may have found it offensive or misleading that Moses should lay even his own life on the line in the negative alternative (v. 11a), while seeming in the positive alternative to be

27. *Synt* §106a.
28. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 2002), 290.
29. O. Kaiser, *Das Buch Jesaja. ATD* XVIII (1983), 271.
30. For the details see C. McCarthy, *The Tiqqune Sopherim and Other Theological Corrections in the MT of the OT. OBO* 36 (1981), 123-26.

concerned solely with saving his life (v. 11b). That the *tiqqun sopherim* does not solve the problems, however, is shown by many later translations that seek to solve them by harmonizing the alternatives posed in v. 11.

The frequent occurrence of *r''* and its derivatives in stock phrases and idioms is due in part to Dtr phraseology, which plays a major role in these formulas.[31] Dtr phraseology probably accounts also for the concentration of *r''* and its derivatives in the book of Jeremiah. This concentration appears to result from the coincidence of the Jeremianic prophecy of judgment, which speaks at length of the people's guilt and God's judgment (both of which can be expressed by forms of *r''*[32]), with the extensive Dtr redaction of the book of Jeremiah, which is devoted to interpreting God's judgment in its own characteristic language.[33]

II. Contexts.

1. *Philosophy and Theology.* Negative experience, whether the result of misfortune or of aggressive and destructive human actions, is an inevitable part of human life; the question of the meaning, source, nature, etc., of evil in the broadest sense therefore arises whenever humans reflect on their existence or attempt to interpret it. From the perspective of philosophy and theology, the question of evil presents itself as a far-reaching problem, demanding terminological and categorical differentiation. In the biblical approach to the problem, too, reflection on these necessary differentiations is indispensable, the more so because Hebrew does not provide an adequate linguistic differentiation.[34]

The phenomenon and problem of evil can be described as follows: "Evil, understood in the broadest sense, refers to everything that is *bad.* It thus includes — to use a classical distinction — both 'physical' evil, directly due to nature, and 'moral' evil, due to human volition; to these, the modern definition of the problem adds 'social' or 'structural' evil, the injustice that falls between necessity and approbation. The thing itself — whether physical, moral, or social — has always eluded the grasp of Western metaphysics, and for good reason: its essence has been impossible to define. Of course the world is full . . . of 'evil.' In itself, however, it appears to be nothing, for it cannot be understood in isolation. There is no such thing as the evil one, nor is there an element of the world that is evil, either inherently or even indirectly. But of course there is always someone or something that is evil. Thus evil appears in the predicate, as an attribute. Its domain is events, actions, and their effects. Possibly this is why it has repeatedly eluded ontological philosophy. 'Evil' is a relational concept: its business is with action and suffering, with human and social interaction. We perceive as evil whatever threatens us, brings disorder, destroys life, turns change into catastrophe. It is, at bot-

---

31. See the tabular lists in M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford, 1972), 320-65; and H. D. Hoffmann, *Reform und Reformen. ATANT* 66 (1980), 325-66.

32. See III.3 below.

33. For a detailed discussion see W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26–45. WMANT* 52 (1981), esp. 92-99.

34. See I.1 above.

tom, an attack on existence and on life. . . . It tends toward death. With lapidary precision, Augustine calls it 'that which harms.'"[35]

In the theological context, the problem of evil appears in the first instance as the problem of suffering: "In all religions, the problem of the origin of suffering as *malum physicum,* as physical, psychical evil (sickness, death, disaster, natural catastrophe), and its relationship to *malum morale,* moral evil, evil as embodied in sin and guilt, characterizes the relationship between the world and the deity."[36] In all religions — but also in many philosophical systems — this experience of physical evil raises the question of the relationship of God or the gods to this phenomenon. The problem of theodicy therefore arises as the necessary consequence of philosophical and theological reflection on the experience of evil and thus permeates all religions.

2. *Religion.* In many religions the various manifestations of evil give occasion to ask about the origin of evil in the world and to venture answers that seek to master the problem. "The various societies and cultures differ in how they experience evil, how they describe it and attempt to master it, so that the complex of problems surrounding evil is structured by different phenomena, depending on the sociocultural setting: suffering, evil, disaster, forces of nature, sickness, death, sin, guilt, Satan, war, injustice, cruelty, attributed to social structures, laws of nature, inherited models of behavior, or the environment."[37]

Various fundamental types of explanation may be categorized religio-historically. In dualistic systems evil appears as an irreconcilable polar opposite to good.[38] Dualism may range from a variety of hostile powers, often personified, such as evil spirits and demons,[39] to personification in the evil one (the devil, Satan, etc.). The latter is developed and accentuated more fully in correlation to the figure of a good God.[40] Besides the notion that the world itself is totally evil (as in Gnosticism[41]), we also find explanations of evil (e.g., in African belief in witchcraft) that attribute "'mischief' to antisocial animus and hostile behavior such as contentiousness, vengefulness, avarice, greed, etc., rather than an evil higher power. Here the ultimate responsibility for good and evil lies in human intentions and actions."[42]

3. *Other Cultures.* a. *Near East.* In the civilization of the ancient Near East, as known primarily from Sumerian, Babylonian, Assyrian, and Ugaritic texts, the problem of evil appears primarily under three heads: (1) demands for proper behavior (eth-

35. Häring, *Problem,* 1-2.
36. Lenzen, 65.
37. *Ibid.*
38. G. Lanczkowski, *TRE,* IX, 199-202.
39. D. Baudy, *Lexikon der Religionen,* 116-20; C. Colpe *et al., RAC,* IX, 546-797.
40. Colpe, 12; G. Mensching, *RGG*³, VI, 704-5; F.-L. Hossfeld and B. Kalthoff, *Lexikon der Religionen,* 579-80.
41. K. Berger, *TRE,* XIII, 519-35; C. Scholten, *Lexikon der Religionen,* 210-12.
42. Multhaupt, 142.

ics and law), (2) attempts to master evil through magic and their corresponding theoretical explanations (incantations and demonology), and (3) the fundamental religious question of the relationship between good and evil (theodicy and retributive justice).

There are many references to evil in ancient Near Eastern texts dealing with law and ethics, in the context of human behavior that departs from accepted norms or harms the social fabric. The normative realms of law and ethics must be kept distinct by proper definition: "Laws stipulate the legal consequences of behavior contrary to accepted norms, whereas ethical norms seek to regulate conduct through the understanding of the individual addressed as an ethical subject apart from the threat of legal sanctions."[43] In the context of the problem under discussion, both realms have as their common purpose the suppression or mastery of evil and injustice, the former end by imposing appropriate sanctions on misconduct, the latter by giving instruction in proper conduct.

In the realm of law, besides the particular statutes that specify injustice and misconduct by regulating situations of conflict or through sanctions, we may cite the prologues and epilogues of legal codes,[44] which, as it were, state the "functions of the law" in this regard. Examples include the Code of Lipit-Ishtar of Isin: "to establish justice in the land, cause lamentation to vanish from the mouth, to turn back animosity, violence, and armed force" (I, 26-30),[45] and the Code of Hammurabi: "to make justice visible in the land, to destroy the evil and the wicked, to prevent the strong from injuring the weak" (I, 32-39), and: "may he [the future king] establish justice for them, decide in their favor, drive the evil and wicked from his land, and promote the welfare of his people" (XLVIII, 88-94).[46] Finally, there are philosophical and theological discussions concerning right and wrong, like the so-called Counsel of Shuruppak (Sumerian; Early Dynastic period)[47] and the second tablet of the Shurpu collection.[48]

We encounter the narrower realm of ethics primarily in wisdom aphorisms,[49] which often treat the "problem of evil" by advocating proper conduct and behavior as well as avoidance of evil, especially in light of the correlation of acts and consequences.[50] These demands appear primarily as concrete instructions on appropriate conduct in the context of sapiential proverbs.[51] This instruction brands various actions as evil while

---

43. E. Otto, *Osnabrücker Hochschulschriften,* III/9 (1987), 136.

44. For a general discussion see G. Ries, *Prolog und Epilog in Gesetzen des Altertums* (Munich, 1983).

45. *TUAT,* I, 24.

46. *TUAT,* I, 40, 77.

47. W. H. P. Römer, *TUAT,* III/1, 48-67.

48. E. Reiner, *Šurpu. BAfO* 11 (1958), 13-18.

49. The fundamental study is W. Richter, *Recht und Ethos. SANT* 15 (1966).

50. See III.4 below.

51. On the background of ancient Near Eastern wisdom, see J. J. A. van Dijk, *La sagesse suméro-accadienne* (Leiden, 1953); E. I. Gordon, *BiOr* 17 (1960) 122-32; *idem, Sumerian Proverbs* (1959); *BWL;* E. Reiner in W. Röllig, ed., *Altorientalische Literaturen* (Wiesbaden, 1978), esp. 195-201. For the various texts and translations, esp. of the so-called counsels of wisdom, see *BWL,* 96ff., and the collection of sources in H. H. Schmid, *Wesen und Geschichte der Weisheit. BZAW* 101 (1966), 232ff.

inculcating good — i.e., socially constructive — conduct (e.g., "Do your opponent no evil, those who do you evil repay with good; meet your enemy with justice"; "Give bread to eat, wine to drink; clothe and honor those who ask for alms"; "Love justice and hate hostile conduct"; "Grievous is the guilt of a man who has sexual relations with another man's wife"); above all, however, it attaches the utmost importance to good rather than evil speech (e.g., "This is a person's treasure: let your lips be precious. Let insult and abuse be an abomination to you, do not utter insolence or false information. Those who engage in idle chatter are scorned. . . . Do not slander, utter what is good, say nothing evil, speak what is good. Whoever slanders speaks evil. . . . Do not speak lies to friends and companions, say nothing vulgar, but speak what is good"). This emphasis points to an important aspect of the basic understanding of "the power of evil" in the ancient Near East: as curses, spells, etc., show, this power can be brought forth and released by the act of human speech, and thus take effect; therefore, it can and must be resisted and exorcised by the same means.

In the context of such encounters with evil, demonology and its associated magic play a crucial role throughout the ancient Near East. The languages of the ancient Near East lack a collective term comparable to the English word "demon"; they have words only for groups of demons, like the so-called seven evil spirits, a somewhat variable but basically canonical roster of Sumerian demons,[52] or they speak simply of "god" or "the evil god."[53] Often the same word may oscillate between good and evil spirits, e.g., Sum. *udug* or Akk. *šēdu* and *rābiṣu.*[54] Among these demons[55] are *nam-tar/namtaru,* "the determiner of destiny," and the female demon *labāṣu,* who causes sickness.[56] Above all, there is *dimme/lamaštu,* another female demon well known from many texts and amulets, who is often associated with childbed fever; but the broad range of her powers suggests that she is closely associated with diseases and infectious dangers of all sorts.[57]

Sumerians and Babylonians appears to have had different explanations for the attacks of demons on human beings. Unlike the Sumerians, the Babylonians considered these attacks to be punishment for sin, so that especially in Babylonian incantations against sickness we find prayers for forgiveness,[58] while the Sumerians trusted more in the practice of magic, even though they did not entirely relinquish invocation of the gods. Quite generally, magic plays an important role in the ancient Near East, both in the form of white magic, to avert harm brought about by a demon, and in the form of black magic, which attempts to inflict harm on others.[59] The struggle against evil and injury brought into the world by demons is therefore primarily the responsibility of a

52. G. Contenau, *La magie chez les Assyriens et les Babyloniens* (Paris, 1947), 86.
53. *AHw,* I, 374, s.v. *ilu(m)* B 1.
54. W. von Soden, *The Ancient Orient* (Eng. trans. Grand Rapids, 1994), 198-200.
55. For a survey of the various demons see E. Ebeling, *RLA,* II, 107-13.
56. W. Farber, *RLA,* VI, 409-10.
57. W. Farber, *RLA,* VI, 439-46.
58. E. S. Gerstenberger, *Der bittende Mensch. WMANT* 51 (1980), esp. 64-112.
59. Von Soden, 197-201.

duly qualified "incantation priest" or "ritual specialist" (Akk. [*w*]*āšipu, mašmaššu*),[60] as is shown by the rituals and incantation texts they used for various situations and circumstances, texts that constitute a major portion of extant Near Eastern literature.[61] The ideas about demons appearing in Ugaritic texts largely agree with those found in Mesopotamia with respect to their influence and the means of counteracting it.[62]

Especially in the case of diseases — even if they were thought to be occasioned by demons — the religious question arises concerning the relationship of the gods to this area of evil, if only to ask why the gods leave human beings at the mercy of demons without intervening. The Babylonians sought the answer in analysis and evaluation of human actions; in other words they viewed human sinfulness as the cause of evil, either on the sapiential principle of the correlation between acts and consequences[63] or in the notion of punishment for sin imposed by the gods. Thus the Shurpu collection of incantations, which is directed against the "ban" *(māmītu)* that separates human beings from God, lists almost two hundred sins of commission and omission; these involve family relationships as well as charity for those in need and protection of animals.[64]

The common experience to the contrary, namely that sinners can certainly thrive while the upright suffer, has left a broad trail in the literature of theodicy (cf. the book of Job).[65] The extent and variety of this literature shows that the central problem of the connection between affliction and the evil committed by the individual or imposed by God in the encounter between God and human beings never found a satisfactory solution.

b. *Egypt.* In its wide range of terms for evil in the widest sense and their associated conceptual distinctions — albeit without a precise terminological distinction between "bad" and "evil"[66] — Egyptian exhibits a broad horizon in which evil is experienced, along with corresponding attempts to explain and master it. As in the Near East, the experience of evil is associated with demons in a wide variety of ways, but Egyptian, too, lacks a single generic term like "demons" for these entities, so that there is also no satisfactory definition for the concept. Instead, we find a large number of different terms used to designate demons, expressing the extremely diverse aspects of demonic activity.[67]

In Egypt, unlike Mesopotamia, we do not find the notion that demons can be alternately good and evil, beneficent and malign. In the Egyptian worldview, the ontological concept of being or nonbeing is more fundamental than the ethical concept of good or bad. While the gods belong to the realm of being, demons are defined by opposition

---

60. W. Mayer, *Untersuchungen zur Formsprache der babylonischen "Gebetsbeschwörung." StPohl,* ser. maior 5/16 (1976), 59.
61. *TUAT,* II.
62. O. Loretz, *Ugarit und die Bibel* (Darmstadt, 1990), 89-90; *TUAT,* II, 299-357.
63. See III.4 below.
64. Von Soden, 186.
65. *TUAT,* III/1, 110ff.
66. See I.1 above.
67. H. te Velde, *LexÄg,* I, 980.

to that realm and thus play only a peripheral role, especially since they do not enjoy their own cult. In Egypt, therefore, it is quite correct to think of demons as "evil spirits."[68]

The fact that the various terms for demons occur primarily in "incantation literature" indicates that the focus of interest is not theoretical demonology but everyday dealing with the effects of evil.[69] Here the realm of magic and sorcery,[70] important for every aspect of Egyptian religion and civilization, plays a major role. Significantly, it appears in conjunction with the question of mastering evil in the remarkable substantiation given for magic in the Instruction for Meri-ka-Re: "He created for them magic as a weapon for them to ward off the blows of disaster, over which watch is kept day and night."[71]

In addition to this domain, devoted in all its variety to combating evil and disaster that have occurred, we find in Egypt diverse concepts for the avoidance of evil, i.e., ethical charges aimed at preventing evil. This material appears primarily in the various "instructions," but also in the "biographies" that outline ideal standards of conduct.

The description and analysis of Egyptian ethics is bound up inextricably with the concept of "universal order" *(maat),* for ethical problems are thought of in large measure as involving disruption of this order, which exists as a given but does not persist automatically. Apart from the problem of theodicy, which is also reflected in Egyptian literature,[72] this concept appears above all in the presence of abstract terminology that instantiates the polarity of "good and evil." Thus we find such formulas as "order in place of disorder" (*maat* vs. *ỉsft*), which, with *ỉsft* replaced by *grg,* "lie, falsehood," takes on the moral connotation "truth vs. falsehood." This moral aspect finds even better expression in the abstract contrast *nfr* vs. *byn,* "good vs. bad." Egyptian texts associate the necessary decision between good and bad that this contrast entails with the heart, the organ that is able to recognize good and evil. In this context we find the notion that God has created the heart good or bad and also that the heart is the "deity within," which enables a person to choose between good and evil.[73]

In the course of Egyptian civilization, we find various phases of development in the realm of ethics. For example, an "empirical ethics" begins with the didactics of social situations and seeks to regulate the social interaction of large and small groups. Later it is joined by more complex forms of ethics governing conduct and attitudes.[74] Only much later do we find a kind of "theologizing" of ethics, which manifests itself not least in the inclusion of God in the (sapiential) correlation of acts and consequences. A text from a Twelfth Dynasty tomb reads: "Every noble who does what is good . . . will (endure upon the earth)." A text on a statue from the Twenty-sixth Dynasty modifies

---

68. *Ibid.,* 981.
69. *TUAT,* II, 358-60.
70. On the distinction see Q. Quack, *Lexikon der Religionen,* 382-83.
71. *RTAT,* 72.
72. See below.
73. E. Otto, *LexÄg,* II, 36-37.
74. *Ibid.,* 34-38.

this to read: "Every noble who does what is beneficial for others . . . God will make endure upon the earth."[75] In the "instructions" of the late period, this theologizing of wisdom conjoins the sapiential correlation of acts and consequences with divine retribution, so that both determine ethical counsels. An example is Papyrus Insinger (ca. 300 B.C.E.), which assembles proverbs related to the central idea that "the evil that befalls the fool is brought upon him by his belly and his phallus," after first warning against "repaying evil with evil," because retribution is in God's hands.[76]

The distinguishing features of Egyptian ethics sketched here are due in no small measure to the highly developed Egyptian ideas concerning the afterlife, for the notion of "judgment after death" transcends the limits of human experience: the balancing of crime and punishment can be linked to the idea of immortality, so that in the life to come God can requite transgressions committed in this life.[77]

The crisis of sapiential thought in the correlation of acts and consequences finds even more pregnant expression in the context of the problem of theodicy. Here, however, Egyptian thought, with its own presuppositions, takes a road entirely different from that taken by the thought of the ancient Near East.[78] "The problem of theodicy erupts not on the plane of dealing with the gods but on a plane that is much more general and comprehensive, what we might call 'dealing with the world.' This takes place in the context of the general intellectual crisis triggered by the collapse of the Old Kingdom, which cast doubt on the possibility of 'realizing *maat*,' the Egyptian conception defining religion in the broadest sense."[79]

The texts devoted to reflection on this problem include the "Reproach of God" from the so-called Admonitions of Ipu-wer (12:1ff.): "It is said that he is the shepherd of all, there is no evil in his heart. Though his flock may be small, he spends the day pasturing it. . . . Brawling and violence against the weak, that is what they (the gods) have created. There was no pilot in their time. Where is he today? Is he perhaps asleep? Behold, his power cannot be seen! . . . Behold, one man strikes another, and your commands are transgressed. When three men set out on a road, (only) two are found: the majority slays the minority! But is there such a thing as a shepherd who loves the death (of his flock)? But now you must find someone to answer."[80] The experience of evil leads the author to charge God with failing to exhibit the necessary concern "for the life of his flock."[81]

This idea is developed further by the Instruction for Meri-ka-Re, where the theme appears in the context of a hymn to God as the good shepherd and preserver of creation. This hymn lists twelve actions of God; with two exceptions, they all have a clear anthropological reference; for the whole well-ordered world was created and is sus-

75. *Ibid.,* 38.
76. E. Brunner-Traut in Röllig, *Altorientalische Literaturen,* 61-62.
77. E. Otto, *LexÄg,* II, 38.
78. See II.3.a above.
79. J. Assmann, *Ägypten* (Stuttgart, 1984), 200.
80. E. Otto, *Der Vorwurf an Gott* (Hildesheim, 1951), 5-6.
81. See also Assmann, 201.

tained for the sake of humankind. Strikingly at variance with this "care exercised by the good shepherd" are the middle and final actions, both of which lack a final purpose with its anthropological reference. These two passages have to do with the slaying of humans and thus exhibit some similarity to the "Reproach of God" cited above. That text, however, bases itself on God's inattention, which leads to violence and murder among the human flock. The Instruction for Meri-ka-Re, however, makes God himself the agent responsible: "He slew his enemies, and even smote his children because they contemplated rebellion. He slew the treacherous of heart among them, as a father beats (to death?) a son for the sake of his brother."

The idea expressed by the "Reproach of God" that God is indifferent, heedless of the world, is intolerable and gives rise to the notion of a "violent God": otherwise the world would be robbed of its coherence. "If the meaningful coherence of the world is to be saved, the will of God must extend even to catastrophes; even a catastrophe must permit interpretation as an act of God. The meaning of God's actions is perceived to be in the punishment of evil."[82] Now the problem of evil in the world shifts to the question of how God wills and acts. "The vanished evidence of the meaningfulness of human existence shifts to the transcendence of the unfathomable will of a hidden God."[83]

A third text, from so-called mortuary literature, more specifically the Apology of the Creator God,[84] also takes up this theme. This text, which presents itself as a speech for the defense with the purpose of "silencing injustice" and "allaying wrath," ascribes the fundamental problem of evil to social inequality and the immorality of scoundrels, expressed in their disregard of the future life and their lack of piety:

> I did four good deeds within the threshold of the land of light:
> I made the four winds,
> that all might breathe in their time.
> That is one of the deeds.
> I made the great inundation,
> that the poor might benefit from it like the rich.
> That is one of the deeds.
> I made each like his neighbor,
> and forbade them to do wrong,
> though their hearts violated my command.
> That is one of the deeds.
> I made their hearts cease to forget the west,
> that pious offerings might be offered to the local gods.
> That is one of the deeds.

This text does not rest content with the natural equality of humankind from the time of creation, but takes up the notion of possible divine indifference from the "Reproach to

82. *Ibid.*, 203-4.
83. *Ibid.*, 204.
84. Coffin Text 1130; Assmann, 205.

God" and refutes it by citing the command of God ("and forbade them to do wrong") and the entire complex of religion and cult ("I made their hearts cease to forget the west . . .").

These three related literary texts not only treat the problem of theodicy in the narrower sense but pursue the problem of evil in the broader sense on the basis of the authors' experience.

In ancient Egypt the question of the evil and injustice encountered in the world as well as the attempts to explain it are not set in the context of theoretical (theological) reflection; they arise very concretely from the experience of the crisis of meaning following the collapse of the Old Kingdom. It is "the meaningful structure of the social and cosmic world, suddenly become impenetrable,"[85] that initiates discussion of "God and evil" and determines its details.

III. Thematic Foci in the OT.

1. *God and Evil.* a. *Theological Background.* A huge number of philosophical and theological approaches focus on the problem of somehow correlating the well-considered notion of God with experiences and explanations of evil.[86] We find no such treatment in the OT; neither does the OT contain any systematic reflection on or definition of the phenomenon of evil. Nevertheless, the associated questions and problems surface in a wide variety of literary contexts dating from all periods. The plethora of texts longs for differentiated explanations of the articulated relationship between God and evil.

It must be noted here that the domain of this problem cannot be restricted to texts using *r*ʿʿ, which are discussed in this article. The various statements about such topics as God's violence must also be taken into account.[87] The passages usually discussed in the present context are therefore connected in part with the often considerable difficulties raised by the anthropomorphic language of the OT.[88] Even more frequently, the monotheism that developed and took root in the OT period engenders a notion of omnipotence that inevitably creates pressure to associate evil and disaster with the one and only God or to explain them from the perspective of this God.[89]

Isa. 45:7 is often cited as the *locus classicus* of this notion.[90] But it is insufficient to observe that the statement, "I form light and create darkness, I make weal and create woe. I am Yahweh, who does all these things," critically expands on the Genesis account of creation (the creation of darkness!) and declares any evil power to be nonexistent.[91] It is precisely against the background of creation theology that the verse conveys

---

85. Assmann, 208.
86. Hygen, 11-12.
87. N. Lohfink, *JBTh* 2 (1987) 106-36; R. Girard, *Das Ende der Gewalt* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1983); see the comments of U. Rüterswörden, *JBTh* 2 (1987) 246-56.
88. F.-L. Hossfeld and B. Schumacher, *Lexikon der Religion,* 24.
89. Hygen, 12-13.
90. On the history of interpretation of this passage see Lindström, 178-79.
91. C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1969), 161-62.

its specific meaning. Noting the antithesis *šālôm* — *ra'* in v. 7b, Haag states emphatically: "The text of Isa. 45:7 has nothing to say about the origin of ethical evil. The subject of the prophetic oracle is instead Yahweh's governance of history."[92] Drawing on more detailed semantic analysis, Lindström goes even further in the direction of identifying a historical locus for this passage: "We have found that the action ascribed to YHWH in Isa 45:7 refers solely to the imminent liberation of Israel from her Babylonian captivity. The *positive* phrases 'who forms light' and 'who makes weal' have to do with YHWH's saving intervention on behalf of his people, while the *negative* phrases 'who creates darkness' and 'who creates woe' refer to Yahweh's destruction of the Babylonian Empire."[93]

As a consequence, Isa. 45:7 cannot be seen as an attack on the widespread dualism of the Persian period.[94] This point is confirmed by the "theological emendation" of this passage in 1QIs, which replaces *šālôm* with *ṭôḇ*, "thus at the same time changing the meaning of *rā'* from historical evil to ethical evil. The analogy of Yahweh's cosmic action to his act of deliverance in history has been transformed into a parallelism in the ethical domain."[95]

In Dt. 32:39, too, Lindström finds antithetical action on the part of Yahweh (deliverance for Israel, disaster for Israel's enemies) like that in Isa. 45:7; he places Am. 3:6 in the same category, where the question "Does disaster befall a city unless Yahweh has done it?" refers to the concrete historical situation of the northern kingdom, not the question of the general causality of evil and disaster.[96] The same point was already made by Koch: "But this sentence should not be torn from its context. According to the parallel statement, which adduces the summons of a trumpet to a military campaign, Amos is talking about war. But in 'omni-causality' Yahweh does not unleash a war against his own people. At most he does so in order to 'finish off' an aura of wickedness that has become excessive. *Rā'â* does not mean a first, original cause. It signifies the absorption and implementation of the results of human wickedness."[97]

Lindström includes Lam. 3:38 in this thematic complex; here too he argues that the text is making a single, very concrete, situational statement, connecting the afflictions of the exile with the divine message spoken by the prophets. The verse has nothing to do with "the sovereign power of the word of God in history"[98] in the sense of a theological monism that attributes all evil as well as all good to God. In sum, Lindström concludes that none of these passages makes Yahweh responsible for evil and disaster, either in general or with respect to Israel.

Lindström thus maintains the *absolute historical contextuality* of such passages, ruling out any universal theological implications. Against this view, one may argue that

92. H. Haag, "Ich mache Heil," 182.
93. P. 198.
94. Contra, e.g., K.-H. Bernhardt, → II, 248.
95. H. Haag, "Ich mache Heil," 182.
96. Lindström, 167-77.
97. K. Koch, *The Prophets*, I (Eng. trans. Philadelphia, 1982), 73-74.
98. H.-J. Kraus, *Klagelieder. BK* XX (^{3}1983), 65.

several passages that attack foreign gods and idols borrow that basic pattern of these very statements, thus suggesting *ex negativo* that the passages just discussed might have a more general theological intention. The general statement that idols and foreign gods "cannot do evil, nor is it in them to do good" (Jer. 10:5; cf. also Isa. 41:23, etc.) can make sense only if, conversely, Yahweh can do good and evil generally. In this sense these statements — even though they expound Yahweh's omnipotence exemplarily in connection with specific situations of Israel — cannot be isolated from their religio-historical background, the monotheism that slowly crystalized in Israel.[99]

The same idea appears to lie behind the statements that refer to the fate of individuals when speaking of the good or evil that Yahweh is able to do. This interpretation is confirmed (again *ex negativo*) by the "sapiential proverb"[100] cited by Zephaniah, "Yahweh will not do good, nor will he do harm" (Zeph. 1:12). The notion of Yahweh's absolute passivity depends on the notion of his universal efficacy ("omni-causality"), because the differentiation between good, which is attributed to Yahweh, and evil, for which competing powers are made responsible, seems no longer tenable. Eccl. 7:14 approaches the problem in similarly general terms: the author ascribes both the "day of prosperity" and the "day of adversity" directly to God, so that humans must accept both equally from God's hand. But it is not the author's purpose to emphasize God's freedom and omnipotence; instead, he uses this notion to "challenge fundamentally the entire system of sapiential thought."[101] Therefore Lindström's observation that the *yôm rā'â* spoken of here refers to the day of each individual's death is insufficient, because the text already presupposes the notion of divine omni-causality.[102]

The same background also explains the familiar question, "Shall we receive the good at the hand of God and not receive the bad?" in the story of Job (Job 2:10; cf. 1:21). This passage no longer asks whether the evil and suffering that a person experiences can be attributed to God, but *why* it comes from God when the individual's conduct toward God has not changed.[103] For the recension of the Job narrative heard in this verse, God's unfathomable but recognized freedom to allow both good and evil to befall an individual is the answer to "the problem of reconciling suffering and godliness."[104]

This thought is developed further in the speeches made by God in the book of Job: because the interpretive model discussed above can no longer explain a preponderance of suffering without totally distorting the image of God by the inclusion of negative, demonic features, there now surfaces the notion of sinister forces of chaos that threaten the world. God must repeatedly destroy this evil in the world; this realization unmasks as unsustainable the charge that God is actually evil (Job 9:24).[105]

---

99. Noort, 121.
100. K. Seybold, *Satirische Prophetie. SBS* 120 (1985), 33.
101. N. Lohfink, *Kohelet. NEB* (1986), 53.
102. Lindström, 157-65.
103. H. Gross, *Ijob. NEB* (1986), 18.
104. L. Schwienhorst-Schönberger and G. Steins, *BZ* 33 (1989) 23.
105. For a general discussion of this position see Keel and Bühlmann.

The phenomenon of an increasingly self-subsistent understanding of evil appears not only in the figure of Satan (also found in the book of Job)[106] but also in the notion of the *rûaḥ rāʿâ* that plays a crucial role in the textual complex of 1 S. 16–19.[107] The "evil spirit" that comes upon Saul and torments him is described in various ways: *rûaḥ hārāʿâ* (16:23), *rûaḥ rāʿâ mēʾēṯ yhwh* (16:14), *rûaḥ ʾᵉlōhîm rāʿâ* (16:15,16; 18:20), *rûaḥ yhwh rāʿâ* (19:9). This language derives from the central feature of charismatic kingship, possession of the *rûaḥ yhwh* (cf. the initial statement in 16:14), and uses it as background for the notion that *indirectly* it is Yahweh (cf. the parallelism *rûaḥ ʾᵉlōhîm* and *rûaḥ rāʿâ*) who brings about Saul's downfall.[108] The question why God should do this remains unanswered. The same is true of the revolt of the Shechemites against Abimelech, which is simply attributed to the fact of a *rûaḥ rāʿâ* sent *(šlḥ)* by God (Jgs. 9:23). The mediation of the *rûaḥ rāʿâ* maintains the ultimate causality of Yahweh with reference to evil, even though humans cannot directly understand and explain such behavior on the part of God (in this context see also the mention of a *rûaḥ šeqer* in 1 K. 22:22).

b. *God's Remorse.* Language that speaks of God's remorse associates evil and affliction directly with Yahweh. This idiom *(nḥm [yhwh] ʾel/ʿal hārāʿâ ʾᵃšer . . .)* expresses the idea that Yahweh changes his mind about some disaster that he has brought about (Jer. 42:10) or, more often, intends to bring about (e.g., Ex. 32:14; Jer. 18:8; 26:3,13; 29:11; 36:3; Jon. 3:10; etc.).[109] This theologoumenon of God's remorse, which becomes the central theme of some passages (e.g., Ex. 32;[110] Jer. 18[111]), displays a variety of facets.[112]

The action of God called "evil, affliction" in this context is linked closely to the nexus of threat of punishment, exhortation to repent, and execution or abrogation of the threat. This context shows that the element of the theme "God's remorse" under discussion here is shaped primarily by the prophetic oracle of judgment,[113] so that the focus of the text is on the hoped-for alteration of God's intention, introduced by the motif of remorse, in response to human repentance. That the punishment is or can be abrogated (Jon. 3:10) is attributed either to God's saving purpose (e.g., Jer. 29:11; here should be included the whole range of OT passages that speak of God's readiness to forgive, without mention of the remorse motif, e.g., Jer. 15:21; Hos. 7:1; Zeph. 3:15; Zec. 8:14-15; Ps. 41:2[1]; Ezr. 9:13) or to divine grace and mercy (e.g., Joel 2:13).

The motif of "God's remorse" — albeit expressed in different language — also plays a central role in Hos. 11, where God's refusal to execute the punishment Israel deserves is grounded in God's being God rather than a mortal (v. 9).[114] The "dispropor-

---

106. On the background and problem see Hossfeld and Kalthoff, *Lexikon der Religionen,* 579-80.

107. → XIII, 389-90; VII, 411-12.

108. Noort, 127-28.

109. See I.3 above; → IX, 345-46.

110. E. Aurelius, *Der Fürbitter Israels. CBOT* 27 (1988), 91-100.

111. J. Schreiner, *Jeremia. NEB* (1986), 115-17.

112. For a detailed discussion see J. Jeremias, *Die Reue Gottes. BSt* 65 (1975); → IX, 347-48.

113. See III.3 below.

114. Jeremias, 52-59.

tion between mercy and punitive justice"[115] that makes itself heard here is then incorporated into the Sinai theophany of J; above all, it is developed further in Ex. 34[116] in combination with the "mercy formula" cited in Joel 2:13.[117] In sum, with respect to Yahweh's punishment, perceived by humans as evil or affliction, we observe a clear interest in emphasizing that Yahweh distances himself from carrying out this evil because of his "nature."

c. *Theodicy.* The OT addresses the classic philosophical and theological problem of "defending God's goodness and justice in the light of the evil and suffering in creation"[118] in a variety of ways, since it disallows the possibility of explaining the phenomenon of evil by means of dualistic explanations. It would be extremely difficult to exclude from the monotheistic notion of God that slowly crystallized in Israel[119] any domain unconnected with the deity Yahweh — including the experience of prevailing injustice and suffering and that of frustrated justice and uprightness. Therefore the problem of theodicy in the OT cannot be limited to the book of Job, even though there — in parallel with similar texts of ancient Near Eastern literature[120] — we find an important focus of OT reflection on this theme.

Outside the book of Job, the most important locus of the problem is the second account of creation (Gen. 2:4b–3:24), where it is incorporated into the etiology of the negative aspects of human life. But the context, the theology of creation, alters the problem of theodicy, which presents itself here as "the justification of God through human wrong,"[121] changing it into the question of the (possible) origin of evil.[122]

The theme of Gen. 2–3 is taken upon only in Ezk. 28:11-19[123] and some late wisdom texts (e.g., Wis. 1:12-15; 2:23-24; Sir. 25:24). Elsewhere wisdom literature in particular approaches the problem of theodicy from the perspective of the acts-consequences correlation, thus associating the experience of affliction immediately with the commission of evil, as its direct consequence. Among the various ways in which the correlation of acts and consequences could reach an intellectual crisis,[124] we will single out the passages that cast doubt on God's active involvement with the world, lamenting — like some Egyptian theology[125] — God's lack of attention to the injustice in the world (e.g., Ps. 10:3-11; 64:6-7[5-6]; 94:1-7; Isa. 29:15-16; Ezk. 9:9; Job 22:12-13).

A different approach to the problem of theodicy in the OT appears in the thematic complex involving the theology of suffering, which achieves a kind of climax in the

---

115. F.-L. Hossfeld, in T. Schneider and L. Ullrich, eds., *Vorsehung und Handeln Gottes. QD* 115 (1988), 80.

116. C. Dohmen, *ThZ* 46 (1990) 289-304.

117. H. Spieckermann, *ZAW* 102 (1990) 1-18.

118. A. Ganoczy, *Lexikon der katholischen Dogmatik* (Freiburg im Breisgau, ^{2}1988), 489.

119. E. Haag, ed., *Gott, der Einzige. QD* 104 (1985).

120. See II.3.a above.

121. W. Kern, *Mysterium Salutis,* III/2, 554.

122. See III.1.d below.

123. E. Haag, *Mensch,* 73-100.

124. See III.4 below.

125. See II.3.b above.

notion (rooted in the ideology of the clan[126]) of vicarious suffering, embodied above all in the Servant Songs of Deutero-Isaiah. When a righteous individual suffers vicariously, the experience of suffering and injustice is set free from the context of acts and consequences as well as from the notion of divine punishment. Vicarious suffering — as pictured in the OT — makes possible a fundamentally new relationship between God and human beings, because it "abrogates" the problem of theodicy. The question of theodicy, however, surfaces in the OT in a wide variety of literary and theological contexts; attempts to deal with it are therefore highly divergent, pointing more to specific religio-historical problems of various periods than to continuously developing attempts at a solution.

d. *The Origin of Evil.* The various questions concerning the relationship between God and evil[127] touch directly on the problem of the origin of evil, in that they raise the question whether the creator God established as part of creation the evil and affliction experienced in the human realm, or other powers besides God give rise to this evil. There is almost no trace of the second — ultimately dualistic — alternative in the OT. Although the OT speaks frequently of demons as hostile powers and of evil spirits,[128] it is permeated and shaped as a whole by a gradually evolving and crystallizing monotheism that even in its various early stages has no room for other self-subsistent divine powers, hostile or subsidiary. The mention of demons in the OT is in part an expression of popular belief, in part a transference of current religious explanations of the world to the deity Yahweh in consequence of his claim to exclusive worship.[129]

Against this background, the question of the origin of evil resolves itself into the problem of theodicy in the context of creation theology. J's account of creation already poses the question of quality of creation and its creator by its etiological explanation of the negative elements of life. The account in Gen. 3:1-7 of the background leading to this situation, describing sin as an act of human free will that draws the punishment of the creator God, makes humanity alone responsible for evil,[130] so that here, as in many other OT passages, the question of the origin of evil as the question "*how* humanity comes to decide in favor of evil"[131] remains unanswered. J is concerned primarily to explain evil as the result of an act of human free will; the motif of "temptation" by the serpent and the motif of punishment help the account succeed. This may be seen clearly in the light of the critical differences in the treatment of the "primal man" theme in Ezk. 28.[132] For J, all that matters is the fact that humans choose evil in their thoughts and actions and thus bring affliction upon others — not why they do this.

---

126. J. Scharbert, *Prolegomena eines Alttestamentlers zur Erbsündenlehre. QD* 37 (1968) 31-44.

127. See III.1.a,c above.

128. M. Görg, *NBL,* 375-77; G. Wanke, *TRE* VIII, 275-77.

129. Lindström; Volz.

130. Dohmen, *Schöpfung,* 246-47.

131. H. Haag, "Ich mache Heil," 182; cf. O. H. Steck, *Wahrnehmungen Gottes im AT: Gesammelte Studien. ThB* 70 (1982), 88.

132. A. Brock-Utne, *Der Gottesgarten* (Oslo, 1935), 107-20.

That evil and disaster are the product of human free will is underlined once more by J in the story of the deluge, where the framework (Gen. 6:5; 8:21) declares that all human inclinations (Gen. 6:5: *kol-yēṣer maḥšᵉḇōṯ libbô*[133]) are evil. This is not true "by nature," however — i.e., it was not so ordained by the creator God. It is due rather to the conscious free decision of the individual, as 8:21 *(yēšer lēḇ hā'āḏām rāʿ minnᵉʿurāyw)* especially emphasizes, not least by choosing the word *nᵉʿurîm* instead of, say, *reḥem.*

That from the very outset J sees evil solely as the result of free human choice is a fundamental statement of the entire narrative. Even the serpent does not alter this situation: its function is to (mis)lead the woman into choosing evil. It is itself neither a divine nor a human figure, as is emphasized by 3:1 as well as by the incorporation of its peculiar way of life into the etiology given in the framework of the punishments decreed by God in 3:14ff. Narratologically, its function is merely exculpatory, so that the origin of evil lies neither in God nor in the human creature, but is *contingent* upon this "middle term" between God and humanity.

In 6:5 and 8:21, two key passages in the composition of the primal history,[134] J arrives at much more than an attempted answer to the question of the origin of evil; here we already have a kind of anthropological definition. "This definition of humanity shows that human 'evil' has no ontic valence, but in fact denotes only a kind of behavior. It is not the heart itself that is called evil, but what it can devise (H. Cohen). This statement forges a clear link to the phenomenon of knowledge, where, in describing the ambivalence and contrariness of human existence, J does not speak of knowledge per se, but merely cites the part of human knowledge that explains our misconduct and perversion."[135]

Closer analysis, however, shows that the problem of (moral) knowledge already takes us beyond the limits of J, since it is connected with the motif of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil in Gen. 2–3. Together with the tree of life, this motif may be ascribed to an expansion of the J text during the period of Manasseh, elaborating the original story of the garden into a story of paradise. This development puts even more stress on the nature of the J narrative as "prototypical background," in this context addressing in greater detail the problem of human moral autonomy.[136] The correlation of human responsibility with the notion of God through inquiry into the origin of evil and disaster is accomplished by JE primarily by outlining more sharply in the flow of the narrative the theonomous basis of moral autonomy (knowledge of good and evil associated directly with likeness to God) and thus understanding moral autonomy theologically as participation in God's providence and care.

A fundamental alteration of this basic idea takes place in the course of the final redaction of the Pentateuch: by linking Gen. 1:1–2:4a with 2:4b–3:24, the redactor was forced to surrender the prototypical nature of the narrative in Gen. 2–3 in favor of a

133. → V, 238.
134. Oberforscher, 87ff.
135. Waschke, 141.
136. Dohmen, *Schöpfung,* 349ff.

"paradigmatic genealogical narrative." This literary transformation totally recasts the problem of evil and human sin. In the R^P conception of Gen. 1–3, sin "affects" the individual in two ways. First, simply by being human, in all circumstances of life until death itself, the individual bears the mark of the primal ancestral sin. This mark must not be conceived as a direct transmission or a biological inheritance, but must be understood against the etiological background as an explanation of why humanity is as it is. Second, in each personal act of sin the individual conforms to the "ancestral paradigm."

This approach to the problem of sin on the part of the Pentateuch redaction likewise has consequences for the problem of evil: precisely when R^P takes human sinfulness as a given while simultaneously incorporating the theme of JE by maintaining the significance of the individual act of sin, the problem of what occasions sin becomes critical. For the Pentateuch redaction, therefore, the occasion of sin — represented by the serpent in the J and JE narrative — becomes the focus of interest. The narrative function played by the serpent in J and JE appears not to satisfy R^P as an answer to the question of what occasions sin. On the other hand, the notion of an evil being as something like a hostile divine principle is beyond the thought or imagination of this redaction (the notion of the serpent in Gen. 2–3 as an autonomous "embodiment of evil" first appears in intertestamental literature[137]).

In the very precise language of Gen. 3:14-15, the R^P makes clear that it is not concerned with the serpent as a biological species. The vividly concrete individual serpent in the narrative of 3:1-7 becomes a *symbol* of evil: it points to the act of the primal ancestors, in which it plays a certain role (tempter); besides the individualizing addition "all the days of your life" in v. 14, note especially the complex alternation of oppositions in v. 15.[138] The understanding of Gen. 2–3 as a paradigmatic ancestral narrative helps explain the meaning of the obscure words of v. 15. Since in the course of pentateuchal redaction the serpent of vv. 1-7 becomes the symbol of evil, which comes into being through the sin of the primal ancestors, the enmity declared in v. 15 between it and the woman and her offspring may be interpreted as the permanent struggle between the individual and temptations to evil. The human individual, though a creature, does not by necessity succumb to every temptation to do evil, need not inevitably follow the paradigm of the primal ancestors, but can instead resist evil. This must be the meaning of the concluding words in v. 15b, which complete the concrete image of the struggle between human and serpent; understood as a hortative, it means that the end of this conflict is not predetermined in favor of one side or the other. Constantly, every particular instance confronts the individual with such a decision to resist evil or succumb to it.[139]

As a symbol of the evil described in the narrative of Gen. 3:1-7, the serpent consequently is not "some sin inherent in the natural order, antecedent to personal sin";[140]

---

137. K. Koch, in T. Rendtorff, ed., *Glaube und Toleranz* (Gütersloh, 1982), 211-42; E. Brandenburger, *Das Böse* (Zurich, 1986), 81-84; F.-L. Hossfeld and B. Kalthoff, *Lexikon der Religionen*, 579-80.

138. Dohmen, *Schöpfung*, 131-48.

139. *Ibid.*, 144-48.

140. Lohfink, "Vorpersonale Böse," 187.

for in 3:1-7 the serpent merely provides the occasion for sin. V. 14 refers to this specific situation, in which the individual failed to resist the temptation to evil, and counters this same (exemplary) situation with a hortative appeal: humans must resist evil![141]

2. *Human Transgressions*. a. *Ethics*. In the first instance, the OT treats the problem of the evil done by human beings in general descriptions of ethical stances and the requirements that may derive from them; the starting point is always the antithetic dyad *ṭôḇ wārāʿ* (or interchangeable synonyms). But the expression *ṭôḇ wārāʿ* is not limited to the moral realm, which instead arises in consequence of a broader and deeper understanding of the expression. In its primary meaning, *ṭôḇ wārāʿ* encompasses everything that benefits life and diminishes or even destroys life. Only secondarily does there emerge the more specific ethical understanding of the expression.[142] Even if the merism *ṭôḇ wārāʿ* covers more than just the totality of ethical experience, this aspect alone is connoted in the primal history in Gen. 2–3. This restriction is shown by the association of the expression with the verb *ydʿ*, "know," and by the motif of likeness to God, so that the knowledge of good and evil described by 3:5 and 3:22 as making humans like God comprehends the various ways in which they master their existence. In this sense, the antithetic dyad *ṭôḇ wārāʿ* is crucial to defining the whole field of OT ethics, above all when one considers that it functions in a wide range of constructions and connotations (e.g., Gen. 44:4; 1 S. 25:21; Ps. 35:12; 38:21[20]; 109:5; Prov. 17:13; Jer. 21:10; 39:16; 44:27; Am. 9:4).[143]

From this perspective, many passages can be understood as variations on the fundamental ethical theme of doing good and departing from evil (cf. the pregnant formula in Ps. 34:15[14]: *sûr mērāʿ waʿᵃśēh-ṭôḇ*); some, however, illustrate the close connection between law and ethics or the translation of moral values into legal principles. This is shown both by language that derives from the legal realm, such as the charge that adversaries have repaid evil for good (e.g., Ps. 35:12; 38:21[20]), and by the immediate juxtaposition of the two realms, as in Am. 5:15: "Hate evil and love good, and establish justice in the gate."

This background helps explain the peculiar (and hence much debated[144]) expressions *lᵉḏaʿtô māʾôs bārāʿ ûḇāḥôr baṭṭôḇ* (Isa. 7:15) and *bᵉṭerem yēḏaʿ hannaʿar māʾōs bārāʿ ûḇāḥōr baṭṭôḇ* (v. 16): following Görg,[145] we may assume that "the ability to distinguish good and evil refers to the 'adjudicational authority' of government"[146] and hence to "the administrative authority of the king,"[147] especially because this interpre-

---

141. On the various readings of Gen. 3:15 as a "protoevangelium" in the history of its interpretation and reception, see Dohmen, *Schöpfung*, 281-93.

142. → V, 309-11.

143. For a discussion of the entire topic, → III, 309-11.

144. A. Laato, *Who Is Immanuel?* (Åbo, 1988), 133-35.

145. M. Görg, *BN* 22 (1983) 120-21; idem, *Gott-König-Reden in Israel und Ägypten. BWANT* 105 (1975), 44.

146. Görg, *BN* 22 (1983) 120.

147. *Ibid.*, 121.

tation fits better with the other statements in Isa. 7[148] than do the many attempts to find here a concept from the realm of developmental psychology.[149] The parallels cited in support of the one or the other interpretation, such as Dt. 1:39[150] or 1 K. 3:9,[151] ultimately demonstrate only that the texts in question must be interpreted on the basis of their context and not solely through their use of the dyadic expression.

b. *Sin.* The root *r''* and its derivatives play a major role in connection with OT passages that have to do with the phenomenon of sin,[152] because both "deviant behavior" and reluctance to repent are qualified as *evil* — especially those actions and attitudes that are connected intimately with social and religious reality. Above all, this observation is illustrated vividly by all the passages that use Dtr phraseology to describe religious and social misconduct with the formula "what is evil in the sight of Yahweh" *(hārā' bᵉ'ênê yhwh).*[153] Both aspects are therefore common in the book of Jeremiah, both in the sections ascribed to the prophet himself and in those belonging to Dtr redactions (e.g., Jer. 1:16; 2:13; 5:28; 13:10; 23:11,14; 25:5; 32:30; 44:9).[154]

The spectrum of religious and cultic transgressions characterized as "sin" by the use of *r''* extends from generalized apostasy from or rebellion against Yahweh, without further detail (e.g., Hos. 7:15, where the words *wᵉ'ēlay yᵉḥaššᵉḇû-rā'* once again illustrate the similarity to social transgression; cf. also Zec. 7:10; 8:17), through highly specific transgressions associated primarily with the actual cult of foreign gods and images (e.g., Ex. 32:22; Dt. 4:25; 9:18; Jgs. 10:6; 1 K. 14:9; Jer. 1:16; 7:30; 35:15), to the problem of sabbath observance, highly important in the late period (Isa. 56:2; Neh. 13:17; in this context mixed marriage is another "late period phenomenon" [Neh. 13:17]).

Religio-cultic and social reality are also conjoined, albeit once again in a different manner, in Ecclesiastes' "critique of religion" (Eccl. 4:17–5:6[5:1-7]), which constitutes the center of the book as a whole.[155] It begins with a sapiential warning against the conduct of fools *(kᵉsîlîm),* who offer sacrifice but do not even know how to keep from doing evil (4:17b[5:1b]). Those who "know," however, possess the fear of God. "This 'fear of God' is clearly not limited to or expressible simply in specific religious observances. Instead, if life can be rescued from inauthenticity, it is the inmost essence of every moment of normal life."[156] They act within the horizon of human freedom and thus are able to do evil. "Fools, who do not know, even if 'by mistake' they constantly undertake the rites of expiation (5:5), are clearly unable to do so (4:17b, which thus depends on 5:5 for its meaning)."[157]

---

148. C. Dohmen, *BN* 31 (1986) 53.

149. F. D. Hubmann, *BN* 26 (1985) 38.

150. G. Braulik, *Deuteronomium 1-16,17. NEB* (1986), 28.

151. J. Arambarri, *Der Wortstamm "hören" im AT. SBB* 20 (1990), 208.

152. Knierim; → חטא *ḥāṭā';* → עון *'āwōn.*

153. See I.3 above.

154. W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1–25. WMANT* 41 (1973); *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26–45. WMANT* 52 (1981).

155. Lohfink, *Kohelet,* 10.

156. *Ibid.,* 40.

157. *Ibid.*

c. *Specialized Legislation.* A specialized group of legal rulings in Deuteronomy is associated with the stereotyped concluding formula *bi'artā hārā' miqqirbêkā* or (twice: Dt. 17:12; 22:22) *mîyiśrā'ēl.* The range of misdeeds is very broad; what they have in common is that all are capital offenses (it must be observed, however, that not all capital offenses involve the *bi'artā* formula). The following offenses are involved: encouragement of apostasy from Yahweh on the part of false prophets or oneiromancers (13:2-6[1-5]), worship of astral bodies as deities (17:2-7), contempt of court in sacral decisions (17:8-13), giving false testimony in court (19:16-19), stubborn and rebellious conduct on the part of a son (21:18-21), falsely accusing one's wife of having had premarital intercourse with another man (22:13-21), adultery with a married woman (22:22), intercourse with a woman betrothed to another man (22:23-24), and kidnaping (24:7).

Much discussion has been devoted to the question whether the *bi'artā* laws may be based somehow on a pre-Dtn legal corpus, parallel to the so-called *tô'ēḇâ* laws.[158] As the story of abomination committed by the men of Gibeah (Jgs. 19–20) vividly illustrates, the *bi'artā* idea does not refer to legal banishment or excommunication[159] but is linked to the notion that such conduct is an assault on the legal and social fabric of the community; this fundamental disruption can be rectified only by elimination of the culprit. Offenses associated with the *bi'artā* formula are thus qualified as assaults on the identity of the people, both with respect to the individual victim as a member of the community and with respect to the totality of the people chosen by Yahweh and claimed as his alone.

3. *Divine Judgment.* Within the corpus of OT passages in which God is the agent of an act qualified as "evil,"[160] those that speak of an act of divine judgment take first place, numerically and thematically. It must be noted here that not every act of God experienced as negative fits terminologically and objectively into the context of divine judgment. Themes such as temptation, hardening of heart, and testing must be distinguished from the theme of judgment in the narrower sense, i.e., God's actions in causal nexus with human actions (*r"* hiphil).[161] It would be wrong, however, to understand the causal nexus between "evil" human actions and the divine judgment they provoke as an automatism, such as appears sometimes in wisdom thought in the correlation of acts and consequences.[162] God's acts of judgment remain essentially an aspect of divine sovereignty, which also involves the motif of God's remorse (esp., e.g., in Hos. 11).[163] Above all, God's sovereignty raises the specific problem of the prophecy of judgment, which in its call for repentance may leave room for a reorientation that can avert God's

---

158. For a summary of the discussion see H. D. Preuss, *Deuteronomium. EdF* 164 (1982), 119-20; O. Kaiser, *Introduction to the OT* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1975), 122-23.

159. As still maintained by G. von Rad, *ThAT,* I, 263.

160. See III.1.a above.

161. On the terminological problems see K. Seybold, *TRE,* XII, 460.

162. See III.4 below.

163. See III.1.b above.

judgment or make it unnecessary, or which, in the form of a definitive proclamation of judgment, maintains and underlines God's intentional decision, excluding any kind of automatism.

The passages that speak of the evil or disaster that Yahweh brings upon human beings or his people as judgment are diverse, widely distributed, and heavily dependent on the particular context (e.g., Ex. 5:22-23; Nu. 32:13; Josh. 23:15; 24:20; 1 K. 2:44; 14:10; 21:29; 2 K. 21:12; Isa. 31:2; 47:11; 66:4; Jer. 1:14; 2:3; 4:6; 5:12; 6:1,19; 7:12; 11:11,17,23; 12:14; 18:11; 19:3,15; 21:10; 22:22; 23:12; 25:29; 31:28; 32:23; 36:31; 39:16; 44:11,29; 45:5; Ezk. 6:10; 1 Ch. 21:7).

The OT language that describes God as executing judgment by doing evil shows "that there is no field of human action and endeavor that lies beyond Yahweh's act of judgment. This conclusion is exemplified by the nuanced reaction to the perversion of the Zion tradition. Even *yhwh bᵉqirbēnû* offers no place of refuge from which one can determine definitively whether Yahweh will bring salvation or disaster. It is indeed the freedom of Yahweh, the irreversibility of the confession הוא אלהים יהוה, that enable the prophets of judgment to challenge Yahweh's saving action at its very root, when confidence in salvation leads to a sense of ownership, of control over and hence determination of the line between salvation and disaster at the hand of Yahweh."[164]

4. *Acts and Consequences.* Besides the ascription of affliction and disaster to a direct act of divine punishment,[165] the OT, especially in texts of sapiential provenance, treats the correlation of acts and consequences as a model for explaining the experience of evil. The inquiry moves from the "evil" consequences to their causes,[166] which must be analogously "evil." This approach is illustrated by Prov. 17:13: "Evil *(rāʿâ)* will not depart from the house of one who returns evil for good." Israel shares this schema with the rest of the ancient Near East,[167] as well as the recognition that its limitations can be observed every day. This recognition leads to an intellectual crisis that is reflected in such OT books as Job and Ecclesiastes.

The latter in particular points up the problem by interjecting the element of actual experience into theological theory and juxtaposing the two: "For sinners do evil a hundred times and yet prolong their lives, but I know the saying: it will be well with those who fear God, because they stand in fear before him" (Eccl. 8:12); or: "In my vain life I have seen everything: there are righteous people who perish despite their righteousness, and there are wicked who prolong their life in their evil-doing" (7:15). Experience totally subverts the acts-consequences schema.[168]

Alongside the correlation of acts and consequences and belief in the "principle of retribution,"[169] the OT therefore develops the notion of a "synthetic conception of

164. Noort, 131.
165. See III.3 above.
166. G. von Rad, *Wisdom in Israel* (Eng. trans. Nashville, 1972), 124-37.
167. See II.3.
168. For a detailed discussion see Lohfink, *Kohelet,* 54.
169. Koch, "Gibt," 166-67.

life"[170] or the "consequential sphere" produced by an act.[171] This notion assumes that individuals determine their own fate by their own actions, which create a sphere that "surrounds them continually, for good or ill."[172] In the OT view, the existence of this sphere and its effects are guaranteed by Yahweh himself, who imposes its effect on the individual's destiny. Especially in the late period, the intellectual crises and empirical incongruities arising from this ideology lead at least in part to reliance on the direct intervention of God to judge or punish.[173] This intervention is isolated from the automatism of retribution. At bottom, it remains enigmatic and inexplicable to the human mind, so that the experience of evil and affliction leaves a "residue" that resists all human attempts at explanation.

IV. LXX. In translating Heb. *r*ʿʿ and its derivatives, the LXX uses a wealth of Greek words (more than thirty), reflecting the broad semantic spectrum of the Hebrew root in its various forms. The largest number of translations employ the two words *kakós* and *ponērós.* There is no semantic distinction between these two Greek words reflecting the distinction between moral and natural evil;[174] in the LXX both *kakós* and *ponērós* encompass a semantic field that ranges from "inferior, useless" through "injurious, detrimental" to "evil."[175] The philosophical and theological problem of evil, which plays an important role in Hellenistic literature and is associated with the word *kakós,* is assigned by the LXX to various other words.[176] Consequently, it is not possible to determine semantic clusters for the various Greek translations of Heb. *r*ʿʿ and its derivatives. We do, however find morphosyntactic clusters. For example, the LXX uses *ponērós* primarily to translate *ra*ʿ, while *kakós* for the most part represents *rāʿâ;* in the case of the verb, the proportion is approximately equal. Among the other Greek equivalents used by the LXX for *r*ʿʿ and its derivatives, *baskaínein* in its various forms is the next most frequent translation after *kakós* and *ponērós.*[177]

Dohmen

V. Dead Sea Scrolls. In the Dead Sea Scrolls the root *r*ʿʿ (ignoring *r*ʿʿ II) occurs 69 times, 50 of which are occurrences of *r*ʿ (predominantly as a noun). The verb appears 15 times as *rʿh* and 4 times as *r*ʿʿ I (always in the hiphil, 3 times as ptcp.).

The various combinations used by the MT, many of them fixed idioms, appear also in the language of the Qumran scrolls: *dbr r*ʿ, "a bad thing" (1QM 7:7; 10:1); *šmr r*ʿ, "bad reputation" (11QT 65:8,15); *rwḥ r*ʿ, "evil spirit" (4Q511 fr. 15, 7; 511 fr. 81, 3); *ʿt r*ʿ, "evil time" (11QPs^a 18:15).

---

170. Fahlgren, 127.
171. Koch, "Gibt," 166.
172. *Ibid.*
173. Seybold, *TRE,* XII, 464-65; see III.1.c above.
174. See I.1 above.
175. Harder, 549-51.
176. Grundmann, 476-77.
177. G. Delling, "βασκαίνω," *TDNT,* I, 594-95.

The Dtn legal formula *b'rt hr' mqrbk/myśr'l,* "you shall eliminate the evil from your midst/from Israel," is quoted several times in the Temple Scroll (54:18; 56:10; 61:10; 64:6; 66:4). We also find *r'* in conjunction with forms of *'yn* (1QH 14:18; 4Q381 frs. 10-11, 2; 504 fr. 5, 2:6; 506 fr. 124, 5; 11QT 55:16). "What is evil in the sight of God" is the criterion of human moral misconduct.

The antithesis *r'/ṭwb,* common in the OT, is rare in the Dead Sea Scrolls (1QSa 1:11; 1QS 2:3; 1Q27 fr. 1, 2:4; 4Q380 fr. 1, 2:5). The import varies: once, doing good also means hating evil. According to 1QSa 1:11, the capacity of a young man to distinguish good from evil is set at the end of his twentieth year. Until he reaches this age, sexual intercourse is forbidden. The citation of reason as the basis for this prohibition may reflect a high standard of marital morality.

In formal agreement with the Aaronic blessing (Nu. 6:22-27; cf. also the Ketef Hinnom plaques), the priestly blessing of the Qumran Essenes contains the same traditional elements, but with substantial internal amplifications: "May he bless you *with all good* and keep you *from all evil, and enlighten your heart with understanding of life. . . .*" These additions increase the precision of the blessing formula, in the sense that good and evil, corresponding to the division of humankind into "children of light" and "children of darkness," call attention to a particular worldview.

Besides its moral meaning, *r'* can refer simply to the severity of a physical defect in a sacrificial animal (11QT 52:4,10; cf. Dt. 17:1; 15:21) or describe a disease as being (particularly) serious (4QDibHam[a] 3:8; 4Q504 fr. 3, 8).

The verbs appearing most often in the context of *r'* or *r'h* are: *b'r,* "remove, eliminate," as an element of the Dtn legal formula; and *'śh,* "do" (1QS 1:7; 1QM 11:4; 4Q380 fr. 1, 2:5; 11QT 55:16), denoting active misconduct, which can also be expressed by *gml.* Then, like *šlm* piel (1QH 6:6) and *šwb* hiphil (1QS 10:18), *gml* in turn can mean retribution for evil (4Q509 fr. 188, 5).

The expression *šûḇ mērā'â,* "turn from evil," appears frequently in the scrolls (1QS 5:14; 4QpPs 37 2:3; 4Q171 frs. 1-2, 2:3); it has developed an extensive field of synonyms.[178] In this expression *r'* has become virtually a synonym for sin (along with *'wlh, 'wn, pš',* etc.); ecclesiologically, it also stands in contrast to everything that refers in any way to the community (*yḥd, bryt,* etc.). In 1QS turning from evil is demonstrated by one's readiness to adhere to God's will, separate oneself from the illegitimate congregation, and integrate oneself into the Qumran community in *tôrâ* and possessions (1QS 5:1). Such conversion is necessary, because it alone can vouchsafe admittance to the community and hence participation in its purity. In turning from evil, one attains the moral qualification that constitutes the concept of "holiness" at Qumran.

For those who continue in their evil ways, however, the consequences are inexorable: those who are evil are blotted out (4Q171 frs. 1-2, 2:2); whoever enters into the covenant with idols in his heart is to be "set apart for evil" (1QS 2:16), thus losing irretrievably all hope of salvation.

Rick

178. H. J. Fabry, *Die Wurzel ŠÛB in der Qumran-Literatur. BBB* 46 (1975), 27-28; → שׁוב *šûḇ.*

רָעַשׁ *rā'aš;* רַעַשׁ *ra'aš*

I. Etymology. II. Usage: 1. General; 2. Individual Texts. III. LXX; Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Etymology. Cognates of Heb. *r'š* include Arab. *ra'asa/ra'aša/ra'iša,* "tremble";[1] Syr. *r'š* (rare), "tear to pieces, smash";[2] and Jewish Aram. *r'š* haphel, "shake."

II. Usage.

1. *General.* The lexeme *r'š* occurs 47 times in the OT — 30 times as a verb (22 times in the qal, once in the niphal, and 7 times in the hiphil) and 17 times as a noun. It denotes a phenomenon involving both sound and movement. Its semantic range extends from earthquake (Am. 1:1) through the clatter of chariots (Jer. 47:3) and the tramping of boots (Isa. 9:4[Eng. 5]) to the rattling of bones (Ezk. 37:7). In parallel we find the lexemes *rgz* (Isa. 13:13; 14:16; Ezk. 12:18; Joel 2:10; Ps. 18:8[7]; 77:19; Job 39:24), *mûg* (Nah. 1:5; Ps. 46:7[6]; cf. v. 4[3]), *mûṭ* (Ps. 46:7[6]; 60:4[2]), *ḥîl* (Jer. 51:29), *g'š* (Ps. 18:8[7]), and *zll* (Jgs. 5:5; cf. v. 4).

2. *Individual Texts.* In Am. 1:1 *ra'aš* refers to an earthquake as a purely natural phenomenon: "in the days of King Uzziah of Judah and in the days of King Jeroboam son of Joash of Israel, two years before the quake." The theophany described in Zec. 14:5a clearly involves an earthquake;[3] v. 5a is an addition inspired by Am. 1:1: "and you shall flee as you fled from the quake *(hāra'aš)* in the days of King Uzziah of Judah."

The usage in Ps. 60:4(2) is figurative — the quaking of the earth is an image of destruction following the nation's military defeat: "You are causing the land to quake *(hir'aštâ),* you are tearing it open; repair the cracks in it, for it is tottering *(māṭâ).*"

The lexeme *r'š* occurs frequently in theophanies; it is usually the earth that quakes, sometimes also the mountains and (in late texts) the heavens. Jgs. 5:4 is undoubtedly the earliest text: "Yahweh, when you went out from Seir, when you marched from the region of Edom, the earth trembled *(rā'āšâ),* and the heavens poured, the heavens indeed poured water"; v. 5a continues: "The mountains quaked *(nāzollû*[4]*)* before Yahweh." Closely related is Ps. 68:9a(8a), "The earth quaked *(rā'āšâ),* the heavens poured down rain at the presence of 'Yahweh,'" introduced by v. 8(7), with its reference to the wandering in the wilderness: "'Yahweh,' when you went out before your

---

rā'aš. B. S. Childs, "The Enemy from the North and the Chaos Tradition," *JBL* 78 (1959) 187-98; J. Jeremias, *Theophanie. WMANT* 10 ([2]1977).

1. Lane, I/3, 1106; Wehr, 345.
2. *LexSyr,* 740.
3. W. Rudolph, *Sacharja 9–14. KAT* XIII/4 (1962), 235 n. 7.
4. *BHS.*

people, when you marched through the wilderness." Either Ps. 68:8-9(7-8) is dependent on Jgs. 5:4-5, or both are based on the same oral tradition.[5]

The theophany in Ps. 18:8-16(7-15) par. 2 S. 22:8-16 begins: "Then the earth reels *(wattig'aš)* and quakes *(wattir'aš)*; the foundations also of the mountains [2 S. 22:8: the heavens] tremble *(yirgāzû)*." In the theophany described in Ps. 77:17-20(16-19), v. 19aβb(18aβb) reads: "Lightnings light up the world, the earth trembles *(rāg^eza)* and quakes *(tir'aš)*." According to Jer. 10:10,12-16, Yahweh "is truly God . . . ; at his wrath the earth quakes *(tir'aš)*, and the nations cannot endure his indignation." Here upheavals in the human world join the tremors of the natural realm. The theophany described in Nah. 1:2a,3b-6, an alphabetic acrostic, does not mention any quaking of the earth, but only of the mountains: "The mountains quake *(rā'^ašû)* before him, and the hills totter *(hiṯmōgāgû)*" (v. 5a).

Ps. 46:7(6) links the coming of Yahweh, at which the earth quakes, with the tradition of the nations' assault on Zion: "Nations are in an uproar, kingdoms reel *(māṭû)*; he utters his voice, the earth totters *(tāmûg)*." The quaking of the earth in v. 4(3) probably also originates in this theophany; here, however, it is not caused by Yahweh's coming but by the impact of the sea: "Its waters roar and foam; mountains quake *(yir'^ašû)* with its tumult."

Several passages link the motif of the earth's quaking, originally associated with theophanies, with the tradition of the "day of Yahweh":[6] "therefore I will make the heavens tremble *('argîz)*, and the earth will be shaken *(w^eṯir'aš)* from [or: 'in' — *min*] its place" (Isa. 13:13a); "I looked at the mountains, and lo, they were quaking *(rō'^ašîm)*" (Jer. 4:24a); "the earth trembles *(rāg^ezâ)* before them [the enemy host[7]], the heavens quake *(rā'^ašû)*" (Joel 2:10a); "Yahweh roars from Zion and utters his voice from Jerusalem; the heavens and the earth quake *(w^er'^ašû)*" (Joel 4:16a[3:16a]); on the day when Gog comes against the land of Israel, "truly there shall be a great shaking *(ra'aš)* in the land of Israel; the fish of the sea, and the birds of the air, and the animals of the field, . . . and all human beings that are on the face of the earth shall quake *(w^er'^ašû)* at my presence" (Ezk. 38:19b-20a; only here are living creatures described as quaking). Isa. 24:18 probably also belongs here:[8] "For the windows of heaven are opened, and the foundations of the earth quake *(wayyir'^ašû)*."

Hag. 2:6b is a special case: the tumult of nature caused by Yahweh does not spread terror but heralds a new act of salvation: "I will cause the heavens and the earth and the sea and the dry land to quake *(mar'îš)*" (cf. v. 21b), with the continuation in v. 7a: "and I will cause all nations to quake *(w^ehir'aštî)*" and bring their treasure to the temple (v. 7b).

Childs does not interpret these texts (Isa. 13:13; Jer. 4:24; Joel 2:10; 4:16[3:16]; Ezk. 38:19-20; Isa. 24:18; Hag. 2:6-7,21) against the background of the theophany tradition. Arguing on the basis of Ps. 46, where watery chaos threatens Zion, and Ps. 77,

5. Jeremias, 10-11.
6. *Ibid.*, 100.
7. H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1977), 47.
8. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13—27* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1997), 500.

where the waters fear Yahweh (v. 17[16], although Childs cites v. 19[18], where the verb *rʿš* in fact occurs), he defines the lexeme *rʿš* as "a *terminus technicus* within the language of the return of chaos." The two interpretations are not necessarily mutually exclusive, but Childs's theory hardly fits Hag. 2:6,21.[9]

Closely related to the "day of Yahweh" is Jer. 51:29a, which describes the reaction when Yahweh summons the nations against Babylon: "then the earth quakes *(wattirʿaš)* and writhes *(wattāḥōl*[10]*)*, for Yahweh's purposes against Babylon stand, to make the land of Babylon a desolation without inhabitant."

According to Isa. 29:6, distressed Jerusalem ("Ariel") will be visited (for its protection[11]) by Yahweh "with thunder *(raʿam)* and quaking *(raʿaš)* and great noise *(qôl gāḏôl),* with whirlwind *(sûp̄â)* and tempest *(seʿārâ),* and the flame of a devouring fire." The echoes of a theophany cannot be missed; *raʿaš,* however, probably does not mean an earthquake[12] but a storm accompanying a theophany.[13]

The unique "anti-theophany" of 1 K. 19:11-12, where Elijah receives Yahweh's message, uses much the same terminology as Isa. 29:6; here too *raʿaš* probably means a storm:[14] "And lo, Yahweh passes by. And a tempest *(rûaḥ),* violent and strong and splitting mountains and breaking rocks, is before Yahweh; Yahweh is not in the wind. And after the wind there is a quaking *(raʿaš);* Yahweh is not in the quaking *(raʿaš).* And after the quaking *(raʿaš)* there is a fire; Yahweh is not in fire. And after the fire there is a sound of soft murmuring." The sequence "tempest — quaking — fire," with the tempest marked explicitly by its appositional qualifiers as the most powerful natural phenomenon, makes it unlikely that *raʿaš* means "earthquake" here.

Here we may also cite Ezk. 3:12: "Then the spirit lifted me up, and I heard behind me the sound of great quaking *(qôl raʿaš gāḏôl)* as the *keḇôḏ yhwh* rose from its place." Here *raʿas* probably means a storm, since the language echoes the coming of Yahweh with "a stormy wind *(rûaḥ seʿārâ)*" and "a great cloud and fire flashing forth" in 1:4. The addendum in v. 13[15] describes in greater details the vague background noise mentioned in v. 12: "the sound *(qôl)* of the wings of the living creatures . . . and the sound *(qôl)* of the wheels . . . and the sound of great quaking *(qôl raʿaš gāḏôl).*"

Am. 9:1a also uses the language of theophany. The prophet[16] or (if *haḵ* is emended to *wayyaḵ*[17] or *ʾakkeh*[18]) Yahweh makes the thresholds quake (if the prophet, the broad semantic compass of *rʿš* leaves open the intensity of the shaking), unleashing universal disaster (vv. 1aβ-4).

---

9. See above.

10. → II, 901.

11. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 2002), 76-77.

12. Jeremias, 71, among others.

13. Wildberger, 77; → VII, 473.

14. On the temporal sequence of the nominal clauses in vv. 11-12, see H. Schmoldt, *BN* 43 (1988) 19-26, albeit with the traditional translation of *raʿaš* as "earthquake."

15. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 139.

16. K. Koch, *The Prophets,* I (Eng. trans. Philadelphia, 1982), 43.

17. Wolff, 334.

18. Rudolph, *Amos. KAT* XIII/2 (1971), 241.

In Isa. 14:16b it is not Yahweh but the might of the world ruler that makes the earth quake; people who come upon the unburied body of the ruler voice their amazement at the radical reversal of fortunes: "Is this the man who made the earth tremble (*rgz* hiphil), who made the kingdoms quake (*mar'îš*)?" In Ezk. 26:15b, conversely, a world-wide quaking is caused by the fall of a political power (Tyre): "Shall not the isles quake (*yir'ašû*) at the sound (*qôl*) of your fall?" In Ezk. 31:16a Yahweh makes the nations quake (*hir'aštî*) at the fall of Pharaoh, the towering tree.

In addition, *r'š* can refer to the shaking of (city) walls caused by horses and chariots (Ezk. 26:10b).

According to Jer. 50:46, human voices can also make the earth tremble: at the news of the capture of Babylon, the earth trembles (*nir'ašâ;* the only occurrence of the niphal; cf. Jer. 49:19-21, with reference to Edom). Jer. 10:22 should be interpreted analogously. Ezk. 27:28 also describes the countryside as shaking at the sound of human voices, here the screams of the drowning sailors when the mighty ship that symbolizes Tyre goes down.

According to Jer. 8:16, the neighing of the stallions of the enemy army makes the land quake.

The noun *ra'aš* also refers to the clatter of (war) chariots (Jer. 47:3), the rumble of their wheels (Nah. 3:2), the tramping of the boots of warriors (Isa. 9:4[5]), and the rattle of the javelin that ricochets off the armor of the crocodile (Job 41:21[29]).

Job 39:19-25 describes the fiery strength of the horse, which "swallows the ground" (v. 24a) with "snorting and excitement" (*bera'aš werōgez*), i.e., "with excited snorting."[19] The hiphil of *r'š* in v. 20a should probably be interpreted in a similar vein: the horse leaps, light as a locust but also snorting majestically.[20]

In three passages *r'š* denotes a slight, gentle trembling or shaking. In Ezekiel's vision of the resurrection of dead Israel (Ezk. 37:1-14), the prophet introduces his account of the revivified bones as follows (v. 7bα): "And so it happened: there was a noise (*qôl*) when I prophesied, and lo, a rustling (*ra'aš*), and the bones came together." Here *qôl* — if it is not to be deleted following the LXX[21] or interpreted as an earthquake[22] — is elucidated by *ra'aš*:[23] the sound is a kind of crackling, associated with movement.

As a symbolic action anticipating the fate of "the inhabitants of Jerusalem in the land of Israel," the prophet is to eat his bread with quaking (*ra'aš*) and drink his water with trembling (*rogzâ*) (Ezk. 12:18). Here again, *ra'aš* — and *rogzâ* — probably do not simply denote trembling but also have an auditory component. Zimmerli cites the related symbolic act in Ezk. 21:11-12(6-7), where the prophet is to moan and sigh (*'nḥ*).[24]

---

19. G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (^{2}1989), 490.
20. But cf. *ibid.,* 515-16.
21. *BHS.*
22. O. Betz, "φωνή," *TDNT,* IX, 280.
23. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 261.
24. *Ezekiel 1,* 425.

In Ps. 72, a prayer for the king, v. 16 contains the petition: "May there be abundance [?] of grain in the land, may it rustle *(yir'aš)* on the tops of the mountains." Gunkel's assertion that "*r'š* is a very powerful word . . . and can hardly be used for the soft whispering of grain" is refuted by Ezk. 37:7 and 12:18.[25] It is therefore unnecessary to emend *yir'aš* to *ye'sar,* "may it be abundant,"[26] or to *yēra' śeh,* "may sheep graze,"[27] or even to posit a root *r'š* II, "be abundant."[28]

III. LXX; Dead Sea Scrolls. The LXX usually translates *r'š* with *seíein, seíesthai,* and *seismós* (*sysseíein,* Hag. 2:7; Ps. 60:4[2]; *sysseismós,* 1 K. 19:11-12). Exceptions are *trémein* (Jer. 4:24), *tarássesthai* (Ps. 46:4[3]), *éntromos gígnesthai* (Ps. 18:8[7]; 77:19[18]), *phobeísthai* (Ezk. 27:28), *odýnē* (Ezk. 12:18), and *orgḗ* (Job 39:24). In Isa. 9:4(5), Ps. 72:16, and Job 39:20, the LXX text differs markedly from the MT; Jer. 10:10 is absent from the LXX.

The only occurrence of the root in the Dead Sea Scrolls, in 4Q381 fr. 24, 10, is dependent on Ps. 18:8a(7a) par. 2 S. 22:8a.

Schmoldt

---

25. H. Gunkel, *Die Psalmen. HKAT* II/2 (⁵1968), 310.
26. H. Gressmann, cited by Gunkel.
27. M. Dahood, *Bibl* 60 (1979) 571-72.
28. *HAL,* III, 1272, citing F. Wutz, *Die Psalmen* (Regensburg, 1925), 187; Lisowsky, 1352.

רָפָא rāpā'

I. Distribution: 1. East Semitic; 2. Northwest Semitic; 3. South Semitic; 4. Onomastics. II. Etymology and Meaning. III. OT: 1. Occurrences and Usage; 2. Narrative Prose; 3. Prophecy; 4. Poetry; 5. Wisdom; 6. Priestly Texts. IV. Human Physicians and the Divine Healer. V. 1. LXX; 2. Dead Sea Scrolls.

---

rāpā'. W. W. Baudissin, *Adonis und Esmun* (Leipzig, 1911); M. L. Brown, *Israel's Divine Healer* (1995); *idem,* "Was There a West Semitic Asklepios?" *UF* 30 (1998/99) 133-54; M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, "Baal *rpu* in KTU 1.109; 1.113 und nach 1.117 VI 25-33," *UF* 12 (1980) 171-82; M. Dietrich and J. Sanmartín, "Die ugaritischen Totengeister *rpu(m)* und die biblischen Rephaim," *UF* 8 (1976) 45-52; E. Ebeling, "Arzt," *RLA,* I, 164-65; M. Fantar, "D'Ugarit à Carthage," *AAAS* 29/30 (1979/80) 213-14; R. M. Good, "Supplementary Remarks on the Ugaritic Funerary Text RS 34.126," *BASOR* 239 (1980) 41-42; G. F. Hasel, "Health and Healing in the OT," *AUSS* 21 (1983) 191-202; J. Hempel, *Heilung als Symbol und Wirklichkeit im biblischen Schrifttum* (Göttingen, ²1965); *idem,* "'Ich bin der Herr, dein Arzt,'" *TLZ* 82

I. Distribution.

1. *East Semitic.* The root *rp'* is unattested in Akkadian except for an Old Babylonian PN *ta-ar-pí-annunītum* (cf. Old Akk. *tarpa-iltum*$^{\mathrm{DINGIR}}$)[1] and the West Semitic loanword *ripûtu* in a letter of Milkili, king of Gezer, requesting Pharaoh to send him *murra ana ripûti,* "myrrh for healing";[2] cf. Heb. *rip'ûṯ*[3] and the element *rip'*- in Amorite personal names of the Mari texts;[4] *ri-pu-ú-ti* in the Amarna texts could reflect the West Semitic pl. **repū't* (cf. Heb. *r^epû'ôṯ*).[5] Other personal names attested primarily in peripheral Akkadian sources (Amarna, Mari, Ugarit, Taanak) clearly exhibit West Semitic influence.[6] In Akkadian the concepts of healing and wholeness are expressed by the verbs *balāṭu* II[7] and *šalāmu;*[8] cf. *asûta epēšu.*[9]

2. *Northwest Semitic.* a. *Ugaritic.* The etymology and precise identity of *rp'* and *rp'm* remain unclear.[10] In spite of considerable use of the root *rp'* in the onomastica, the Ugaritic texts have yielded only one definite occurrence of *rp' (km trp' hn n'r).*[11] According to Rainey,[12] the verb here is **ta/urappi'ā,* but the damaged context precludes certainty.[13] The reading *yrp['w]km* in *KTU,* 1.21, II, 5-6 is conjectural and without contextual support. In *KTU,* 1.19, III, 12-13, *bny* (opposite *ṯbr,* "break") is used for "heal, remake."[14]

(1957) 809-26; J. Hempel and O. Michel, "Heilen," *BHHW,* II, 678-81; P. Humbert, "Maladie et médecine dans l'AT," *RHPR* 44 (1964) 1-29; W. A. Jayne, *The Healing Gods of Ancient Civilizations* (New Haven, 1925); A. Lemaire, "Nouveaux sceaux nord-ouest sémitiques," *Sem* 33 (1983) 17-31; C. E. L'Heureux, *Rank Among the Canaanite Gods. HSM* 21 (1979); N. Lohfink, "'Ich bin Jahwe, dein Arzt' (Ex 15,26)," in *"Ich will euer Gott werden". SBS* 100 (^{2}1982), 11-73; O. Loretz, "Ugaritische und hebräische Lexikographie (III)," *UF* 14 (1983) 141-48; H. Michaud, "A propos d'un passage des Hymnes (1QHôdayôt), II, 7-14)," *RevQ* 1 (1958/59) 413-16; J. C. de Moor, "Rāpi'ūma — Rephaim," *ZAW* 88 (1976) 323-45; S. Ribicini and P. Xella, "Milk'aštart, *mlk(m)* e la tradizione siropalestinese sui Refaim," *RSF* 7 (1979) 145-58; K. Stendahl, "Gamla Testamentets föreställingar om helandet," *SEÅ* 15 (1950) 5-33; H.-J. Stoebe, "רפא *rp'* heilen," *THAT,* II, 803-9.

→ רפאים *r^epā'îm.*

1. *AHw,* II, 956; cf. *ripītu, AHw,* II, 987.
2. EA 269:17; cf. *AHw,* II, 987; *CAD,* M/II, 221 *(murru).*
3. *HAL,* III, 1274.
4. *APNM,* 264.
5. D. Sivan, *Grammatical Analysis and Glossary of the Northwest Semitic Vocables in Akkadian Texts of the 15th-13th Centuries B.C. from Canaan and Syria. AOAT* 214 (1984), 30, 101.
6. *Ibid.,* 264-65; *APNM,* 263-64; Brown, *Israel's Divine Healer,* 256 n. 42. For the Old Babylonian and Old Akkadian names see J. Fowler, *Theophoric Personal Names in Ancient Hebrew. JSOTSup* 49 (1988), 228, 273 n. 69.
7. *AHw,* I, 99; *CAD,* B, 52-63.
8. *AHw,* III, 1143-45.
9. *AHw,* I, 77; *CAD,* A/II, 351-52.
10. → רפאים *r^epā'îm.*
11. *KTU,* 1.114, 28.
12. A. F. Rainey, *JAOS* 94 (1974) 187.
13. For details see L'Heureux, 159-60; and esp. de Moor.
14. *UT,* no. 483; D. Sperling, *EncJud,* XIV, 80; Tg. to 1 K. 18:30.

b. *Aramaic.* Except in personal names, *rp'* is attested only four times in Aramaic (the reading *rp'why* in 1QapGen 20:28-29[15] is unlikely): once or twice in the proverbs of Ahiqar,[16] once in the Aramaic fragments of Enoch (4QEnastr^c fr. 1, 2:2: *lrpy' 'r"* *wl'hyth;*[17] on *rp'* in parallel with → חיה *ḥāyâ,* cf. Ps. 30:3-4[Eng. 2-3]; Prov. 4:22; 15:4[18]), and once in the writings of Ephraem.[19] Despite Canaanite influence on the Ahiqar proverbs collection, *rpw'h* in l. 100 should be seen as an example of genuine Old Aramaic usage before the lexical field in Aramaic was displaced by the Akkadian loanword *'sy* (Aram. *'āsyā,* "physician," from Akk. *asû* [< Sum. A-ZU]; the Aramaic verb *'sy* is denominative[20]). The word *lrpy'* in the Astronomical Book of Enoch (1st century B.C.E.) could preserve a vestige of the earlier usage of the root, but its presence here more likely reflects a Hebrew prototype (cf. also the name of the angel Raphael). Finally, the totally isolated *rapyā'* (a wordplay on *m^{e}rapyā'* < *rpy*) in Ephraem (4th century) can be explained only as a (borrowed) nonce word.[21] Names including the element *rp'* are found at Elephantine *(rpyh, yrph)* and, with various theophorous elements, at Palmyra *(rp'bwl, rp'l, smrp').*

c. *Phoenician-Punic.* A single Phoenician inscription from Cyprus[22] reads *b'l mrp',* "Baal the Healer" (**m^{e}rappē'* or **marpē'/*merpā'*);[23] note also *mrp'* (pl. *mrp'm*), the seventh month of the Phoenician calendar. All other attestations of *rp'* are from (Neo-)Punic sources, and all but one *(šm['q]l' rpy')*[24] are participles in the context "PN the physician."[25]

3. *South Semitic.* Two distinct semantic developments of *rf'* are attested in South Semitic: Old South Arabic "heal" (a meaning that may be regarded as certain)[26] and Classical Arabic "mend, darn, repair"; meanings such as "draw near, pull a boat to shore," and esp. "appease" are actually related to *rafā*[*w*]; cf. also *rafuha.*[27] The noun *rifā* (< *rfw?*) does not mean "health," nor does it have any reference to fertility.[28] Soq. *terof*

15. Beyer, 176-77.
16. Lines 100, 154.
17. J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch* (Oxford, 1976), 285.
18. See III.5 below.
19. *LexSyr,* 740; T. Nöldeke, *ZDMG* 40 (1886) 723.
20. S. A. Kaufman, *Akkadian Influence on Aramaic. AS* 19 (1974), 37; Stoebe, 803-4.
21. This citation is the sole basis for Brockelmann's Syr. *r^{e}pā'* "sanavit, firmavit" (*LexSyr,* 740); the (erroneous) theory of a Syr. *rp'* "heal," is quite common: *BDB,* 950; *GesB,* 769; *HAL,* III, 1273; L. Costaz, *Dictionnaire Syrique-Français* (Beirut, 1963), 351; cf. the comments of Stendahl, 8.
22. *CIS,* I, 41, 3.
23. Brown, 58, 286 n. 171.
24. *KAI,* 66.2; see R. S. Tomback, *A Comparative Semitic Lexicon of the Phoenician and Punic Languages* (Missoula, 1978), 305-6; *DISO,* 282; also Baudissin, 243-44; Jayne, 135-40; *KAI,* II, 81.
25. On the orthography *(hrp', hrp, hr'b')* see J. Friedrich, *Phönizisch-punische Grammatik. AnOr* 32 (1951), 43; note also the vocalized form *rufe* in Poenulus, 1006, and the PN *rp'* (Benz, 410-11).
26. A. Jamme, *Sabaean Inscriptions* (Baltimore, 1962), 190-91 (700.16); *RES,* 4829, 2-3.
27. Lane, I/3, 1117-18, 1128-29; Wehr, 348, 351-52.
28. Contra Good, 41.

is also probably unrelated to *rf'*. Ethiopic (Ge'ez) usage is limited almost entirely to the meaning "sew," even though *rafā'ī* is twice translated "helper, protector, healer."[29] In Arabic and Old South Arabic personal names, the specific meaning of *rf'* is difficult if not impossible to determine.[30] "Heal, physician" is expressed in Arabic primarily by *šafā(y)* and *ṭabba/ṭabīb,* in Ge'ez by *fawwasa/mafawwĕš.*[31]

4. *Onomastics.* The widespread popularity of *rp'* names in the ancient Near East, coupled with the great number of deities attested in the theophoric names (cf. also toponyms such as Irpeel [Josh. 18:27]), indicates the religious and cultural importance associated with acts of healing and restoration. While one cannot be sure of the original significance of a given name, it is reasonable to suggest that OT names such as *r^e^pā'ēl* ("God/El has healed"), *r^e^pāyâ* ("Yahweh has healed"), and *rāpû* ("healed") commemorate a significant act of (apparent) divine healing or restoration — e.g., the healing of a mother's barrenness (cf. Gen. 20:17), the birth of a healthy child after an endangered pregnancy or previous infant death, or the healing of a family member who had been seriously ill. It is also possible that these names should be understood against the broader background of the Hebrew usage of *rp'*.[32] Names with the active participle, such as "the god X heals" (e.g., *am-mu/ḫa-am-mu-ra-pi*), are extremely common and certainly originated in historical contexts; but their continued use primarily reflects devotion to the deity in question and not necessarily a specific healing act. The unequivocal statement "I am Yahweh your physician" (*'anî yhwh rôp^e'ekā,* Ex. 15:26) must be seen against this background.[33]

II. Etymology and Meaning. Many have suggested that the original meaning of *rp'* (as a West Semitic root) is "bring together, draw near"; but this definition relies too heavily on the Classical Arabic evidence (which is not entirely certain[34]), to the neglect of the older Northwest Semitic (and Old South Arabic) evidence. It is better to see the basic meaning of *rp'* as "restore, make whole" (in Old South Arabic applied to persons: "heal"; in Arabic and Ethiopic applied to garments: "mend, sew").[35] All the semantic developments attested in the OT flow from this single source: healing a sick body (2 K. 20:5), repairing a destroyed altar (1 K. 18:30), restoring a drought-stricken land devoured by locusts (2 Ch. 7:14), purifying undrinkable water (2 K. 2:21-22), mending the earth's fissures (Ps. 60:4[2]), fixing a smashed piece of pottery (Jer. 19:11), recovery of a mildew-infected house (Lev. 14:48).

Previous etymological understandings of Heb. *rp'* have been built on secondary mean-

---

29. *LexLingAeth,* 320; W. Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez* (Weisbaden, 1987), 463.
30. Ryckmans, I, 202, 249; Baudissin, 319-20; T. Nöldeke, *Personennamen,* 100.
31. *LexLingAeth,* 1376-77; Leslau, 172.
32. See II below.
33. See IV below.
34. See I.3 above.
35. See Ibn Barun on Jer. 17:14; the meaning "sew together" that Stoebe (p. 803) finds basic for South (and Proto-) Semitic probably represents an independent semantic development.

ings of the root, usually representing developments of the common (but not primary) OT meaning "heal." This approach has resulted in a false dichotomy between literal healing (of a physical illness) and figurative or metaphorical healing (of the hurts of the nation),[36] sometimes yielding impossible translations (2 Ch. 7:14: "I will heal their land"). Others have imposed later South Semitic meanings such as "sew (together)" on the OT material, although these meanings are not attested in Hebrew usage.[37] Careful analysis of the OT materials shows, however, that *rp'* is used in every instance with reference to restoring a wrong, sick, broken, or deficient condition to its original and proper state.[38] While a relationship between *rp'* and *rph* has sometimes been posited,[39] the roots do not evince true semantic polarity, nor can any Proto-Semitic connection be established.

III. OT.

1. *Occurrences and Usage.* The root *rp'* occurs 67 times as a verb (qal 38 times, niphal 17, piel 9, hithpael 3) and 19 times as a nominal derivative (*marpē'* 14 times [in Eccl. 10:4, Prov. 14:30, and possibly also Prov. 15:4, *marpē'* = *marpēh*], *r^epu'â* 3 times [always pl.], *rip'ûṯ* and *t^erûpâ* once each). There are 7 instances of defective orthography where the verb is treated as a *tertia y* form (2 K. 2:22; Jer. 3:22; 8:11; 19:11; 51:9; Ps. 60:4[2]; Job 5:18). In Jer. 38:4 *m^erappē'* is derived from *rph;* in 2 K. 2:21, *rippi'ṯî* is vocalized as a piel of *rph* (cf. also Jer. 51:9). The object of *rp'* may be either direct (e.g., Gen. 20:17; 1 K. 18:30) or indirect (with *l^e*, e.g., Nu. 12:13; 2 K. 2:21; cf. Isa. 53:5).

Synonymous expressions include → חיה *ḥyh* piel (2 K. 20:7; Ps. 30:4[3]), *ḥbš* (Ezk. 30:21), *ghh* (Hos. 5:13; *gēhâ,* Prov. 17:22), *'^arukâ* (Jer. 30:17; always with *'lh* except in Isa. 58:8; cf. *t^e'ālâ,* Jer. 30:13), *ḥdš* (2 Ch. 24:12), and more broadly *(šûḇ)* → שבות *š^eḇûṯ* (Jer. 33:7; Hos. 6:11). Antonyms include → שבר *šbr,* → מחץ *māḥaṣ,* → נגף *nāgap,* and → נכה *nkh.*

The varied nuances of *rp'* are highlighted most easily when the biblical material is grouped according to literary categories, since, with the exception of prophetic (and sapiential?) influence on historically very late texts, no clear diachronic development of our root can be demonstrated.

2. *Narrative Prose.* The commonest meaning of *rp'* in narrative texts is "heal" (qal, Nu. 12:13; 2 K. 20:5,8;[40] niphal, "be healed," Dt. 28:27,35; 1 S. 6:3; piel, "arrange for healing," Ex. 21:19 [twice]; hithpael, "get healed, recover," 2 K. 8:29; 9:15; 2 Ch. 22:6; *l^e'ên marpē',* 2 Ch. 21:18). In 2 Ch. 30:20 *wayyirpā' 'eṯ-hā'ām* probably means instead

---

36. *BDB,* 950-51; *GesB,* 769-70; *HAL,* III, 1274 (1 K. 18:30 is cited under the piel, "heal"); A. Oepke, "ἰάομαι," *TDNT,* III, 201-3.

37. L. Köhler, *Der hebräische Mensch* (1953), 40; H. W. Wolff, *Anthropology of the OT* (Eng. trans. Philadelphia, 1974), 145; the *rōp^e'ê '^elil* of Job 13:4b are simply quacks (A. Dillmann, *KEHAT* II³, 120-21; cf. S. R. Driver and G. B. Gray, *Job. ICC* [1986], 121).

38. Baudissin, 385-86; A. B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel,* V (Leipzig, 1912), 200.

39. R. Gordis, *JQR* 27 (1936/37) 55-56; F. Delitzsch, *BC* IV/3, 202, on Prov. 12:18.

40. On the ptcp. see IV below.

that Yahweh spared the people, pardoning their disobedience and cultic uncleanness (vv. 18-19). Gen. 20:17 (qal) and 2 K. 2:21-22 (piel/niphal) do not require the specific nuance of "make fertile":[41] in Gen. 20 God restores Abimelech and his women to their normal reproductive state ("healing" them of the abnormal condition of barrenness); in 2 K. 2 God restores the water to its natural state (making it fresh and drinkable; cf. 2 Ch. 7:14; 1 K. 18:30[42]). Irreversible situations, conversely, are termed "incurable, irremediable" *(lᵉ'ên marpē')*, whether physical illness (2 Ch. 21:18; cf. Dt. 28:27,35) or hopeless apostasy (2 Ch. 36:16; cf. Jer. 8:15; 14:19; 19:11; Prov. 6:15; 29:1).

3. *Prophecy.* The most frequent use of *rp'* is in prophetic texts: 18 times in Jeremiah, 7 in Isaiah, 5 in Hosea, 2 in Ezekiel,[43] and once each in Malachi and Zechariah. It occurs most often in the context of reversal of the effects of divine judgment (e.g., Isa. 19:22, with *ngp;* 30:26b: *ûmaḥaṣ makkāṯô yirpā'* — the extent of God's "healing" could be no less literal than the effects of God's "smiting"). This usage is further underscored by the frequent metaphorical descriptions of "sin-sick" Israel as a wounded and diseased body (Isa. 1:5-6; Hos. 5:13).[44] The graphic imagery of the metaphor has as its natural corollary the literality of the promised restoration (the whole person is wholly healed; cf. Isa. 53:4-5, where the servant's wounds bring healing for *ḥᵒlî, maḵ'ōḇ, peša'*, and *'āwôn;* contrast the spiritualizing tendencies of the LXX and Tg. with Mt. 8:16-17).

This usage of *rp'* is especially clear in Jeremiah (under the influence of Hosea?): although the people are beaten and sick (6:7b) and there is neither physician, medicament, nor cure (8:22; 30:12-13), the false prophets only superficially treat the fracture of God's people *(wayyᵉrappᵉ'û 'eṯ-šeḇer 'ammî 'al-nᵉqallâ)*, crying "All is well, all is well," when nothing is well (*šālôm šālôm wᵉ'ên šālôm,* 6:14; 8:11; cf. *šālôm* par. *marpē'* in 8:15; Isa. 53:5; 57:19[45]). Jeremiah's own pain likewise seems incurable (Jer. 8:21-22; 15:18). Though the ailments of Babylon and Egypt can never he treated (51:8-9, "we tried to heal Babylon, but she could not be healed"; 46:11), God will one day heal his people's wounds (30:17ff.), resulting in complete restoration for Israel and Judah (33:6ff.), with cities rebuilt, sins forgiven, and prosperity and favor enjoyed. The "faithlessness" of Jer. 3:22 and Hos. 14:5(4) is conceived of as a spiritual malady, which God heals upon repentance (cf. 1QH 2:8[46]); hence *rp'* does not mean "forgive" here (Bab. *Meg.* 17b).[47]

4. *Poetry.* All 11 occurrences of *rp'* in poetry are verbal (qal); the usage in the 7 Psalms texts is particularly instructive. Because sin brings sickness in its wake, the psalmist can pray: "Lord, be gracious to me, heal me *(rᵉp̄ā'â nap̄šî),* for I have sinned

41. Contra J. Gray, *Legacy of Canaan. SVT* 5 (²1965), 18; see I.3 above.
42. See II above.
43. On Ezk. 40–48 see III.6 below.
44. Hempel, *Heilung,* 238-39.
45. See I above.
46. See V.2 below.
47. A. B. Ehrlich, *Mikrâ ki-Pheshutô,* III (1901), 182.

against you" (Ps. 41:5[4]); physical healing is certainly meant here; cf. vv. 4,6,11 (3,5,10) and 6:3(2); 38:3ff.(2ff.). Such critical illness was viewed as a descent into the grave or the netherworld (30:3-4[2-3]; 103:4a); cf. the common Akkadian divine epithet *muballiṭ mītē*, "giver of life to the dead" = "healer of the sick."[48] Confession of sin brings healing of its consequences (sickness); see esp. 103:3: *sōlēaḥ ʿāwōn* par. *rōpē' taḥalûʾîm* (cf. 107:19-20; Isa. 33:24). The God who wounds is the same God who forgives and heals (Dt. 32:39: "I have smitten and I will heal"); cf. the description of Yahweh as *hmkh whrwp'/mrp'* in Hebrew and Aramaic prayers and incantations.[49] Dt. 32:39, applied (incorrectly!) by Eliphaz in Job 5:18, probably underlies much of later prophetic usage (Hos. 6:1; Isa. 30:26). If the people repent, no "breach" (Ps. 60:4[2]; Lam. 2:13) can be too great.

5. *Wisdom.* With the exception of Eccl. 3:3, where the antithetical parallelism of *laharôg* and *lirpô'* (Syr. *lemaḥāyû*) suggests the translation "a time for killing and a time for restoring,"[50] only nominal forms appear in wisdom literature: *rip'ûṯ* (par. *šiqqûy*) promised to those who fear God and shun evil (Prov. 3:7-8); *marpē'* (lit. "healing cure, remedy") with reference to the therapeutic effect of wise words (Prov. 4:20-22; 15:4 [both with *ḥayyîm*];[51] 12:18; 16:24; cf. also 13:17; and note the decidedly literal referents *šōr* [3:8], *bāśār* [4:22], and *ʿeṣem* [16:24; cf. 3:8b; 12:4; 14:30]). Those who reject Wisdom's warnings "will suddenly be destroyed without remedy" (*peṯaʿ yiššāḇēr weʾên marpē'*, 6:15; 29:1).

6. *Priestly Texts.* The priestly usage of *rp'* (niphal, Lev. 13:18,37; 14:3,48; Ezk. 47:8,9,11; *terûpâ*, 47:12) is significant. In Leviticus the subject of the declaration "it is healed *(nirpā')*" ranges from an infectious skin disease to mildew (both conceived as an infectious and contaminating "plague" [*negaʿ*], the former being the epitome of a bodily condition that is "not whole/well" [Nu. 12:12b]).[52] Ezekiel uses the niphal to describe salt water that has been made potable. Thus what is in view here is not a "healing" in the strict sense but a "making whole" as a priestly term for a change from unclean to clean, from defective to complete.[53] Thus the state designated by *nirpā'* indicates the restoration of both the infected house and the afflicted individual to their original, proper, and ideal condition (cf. also Lev. 14:41-42). In Ezekiel's vision of the temple, the temple river enables the water of the Dead Sea to support life *(wenirpeʾû hammayim)*, so that the leaves of the trees that thrive along its shores even serve for healing *(terûpâ)*.[54]

---

48. Ludlul, IV, 1-10, 29-36 (*BWL*, 59-60); Baudissin, 313; *ANET*³, 23; *RTAT*, 67 (Amun).
49. J. Naveh and S. Shaked, *Amulets and Magic Bowls* (Jerusalem, 1985), 45; EA 238:30-33; *RSP*, II, 393.
50. But see Ehrlich, *Randglossen*, VII (1914), 64-65.
51. See I.2.b above.
52. G. J. Wenham, *Leviticus. NICOT* (1979), 192.
53. See the discussion of 2 Ch. 30:20 in III.2 above.
54. On the LXX see V.1 below.

IV. Human Physicians and the Divine Healer. As the paucity of medical texts and the absence of any official "religious healers" suggest, the OT stands in marked contrast to the general ancient Near Eastern pattern attested in Mesopotamia and Egypt. The hundreds of Akkadian "medical" documents, describing in detail the activities of *āsû* (physician) and *āšipu* (exorcist) and replete with Sumerian medical words and phrases, evidence a highly developed system integrating folk belief, religious and magical ritual, and prescribed treatments.[55] In Egypt most of the physicians were priests; the medical libraries, whose texts attest a historical degeneration from medicine to magic, were often housed in temples.[56] By contrast, the Israelite priests functioned only as hygienists and observers (Lev. 13–14). It was the prophets, endowed with the divine word, who sometimes appear as agents of healing (2 K. 5:14; 20:7).

Now this does not imply that Yahweh's "healing monopoly" (cf. Philo's description of Yahweh as *mónos iatrós*) excluded all other medical ways and means. Ex. 21:19 legislates medical treatment for an injured Israelite.[57] The plaintive cry of Jer. 8:22, "Is there no balm in Gilead, is there no physician there?" implies the acknowledged usefulness of the *rôpē'* and of medicine. (The reference in Gen. 50:2 to the *rôpᵉ'îm* who embalmed Joseph should be understood simply as an equivalent to Egyp. *swnw,* "physician."[58]) Passing references to everyday medical practices, generally in the context of prophetic metaphors, are not uncommon (setting a fracture, Ezk. 30:21; treatment of wounds, Isa. 1:6; care of sick animals, Ezk. 34:4; Zec. 11:16). Religious or superstitious dependence on physicians, however, was strictly proscribed; only against this background is the nature of Asa's sin in 2 Ch. 16:12 clear: suffering from an illness inflicted as a divine punishment, in contrast to his earlier reliance on God (2 Ch. 14:10[11]; 15:1-15; 16:7-11), "he did not seek Yahweh *(dāraš 'eṯ-yhwh)* but rather inquired of the physicians *(dāraš bārôpᵉ'îm),*" i.e., he sought magical and/or oracular help from (pagan?) physicians.[59] Ironically, it is possible that the name Asa stands for *'āsā'ēl/yâ,* "God/Yahweh (is) my physician."[60]

Sir. 38 advises the sufferer to pray, leave off from sin, and consult the physician (who will also pray to God, v. 13-14), since God created both the physician and healing medicines. This mediating view goes well beyond that of the OT (cf. Bab. *Ber.* 60a, where God is supplicated as the "reliable physician" [*rôpē' neᵓᵉmān*] before bloodletting).

With regard to the role of the divine healer in the biblical world, it is probably correct to state that there was no Semitic deity known primarily as a healer,[61] although de Moor has sought to portray Baal as a West Semitic Asklepios by rending Ugar. *rp'* as

---

55. E. K. Ritter, *FS B. Landsberger. AS* 16 (1965), 299-321; R. Labat, *Traité akkadien de diagnostique et prognostique médicaux* I (Paris, 1951).

56. H. Grapow, *Grundriss der Medizin der alten Ägypter* (Berlin, 1954-62).

57. Cf. CH 206, LXX, and Tg.

58. See LXX and W. Spiegelberg, *OLZ* 26 (1923) 421-24.

59. W. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher. HAT* XXI (1955), 249.

60. *HAL,* I, 73; Fowler, *Theophoric Personal Names,* 159.

61. Baudissin, 311; Jayne, 52.

"savior." Nonetheless, virtually all the major deities of the ancient Near East were extolled in their religious literature as savior-healer-deliverers (a single concept).[62] (Of course, the biblical concept of "salvation" involves both spirit *and* body.[63]) Mesopotamian texts, for instance, hail Marduk as "lord of life" *(bēl balāṭi)* "who gives life/health to the gods" *(nādin balāṭ ilāni),* "the physician" *(āsû)* "who loves to heal" *(ša bulluṭu irammu);* the goddess Gula is "the great physician" *(azûgallatu)* who knows how to heal and effects cures for all.[64] Among the many Egyptian healing deities, Amun is praised as "the physician who makes the eye healthy without medicine," Horus is "the chief physician in the house of Re," and Isis excels in the treatment of children.[65]

These observations constitute the context of Ex. 15:22-27, which speaks of Yahweh as the physician of his people: this context includes a demonstration of divine assistance (v. 25a) coupled with a call for absolute covenant loyalty (vv. 25b-26a). Long life, health, and fertility (of human, livestock, and land) are included as blessings for covenant obedience (Ex. 15:26; 23:25-26; Dt. 7:18; 28:4; Ps. 91:14-16), while infertility and incurable disease (Dt. 28:18,21-24,27-28,35,59-61[66]) are among the consequences of covenantal breach, since rejecting Yahweh as God also means rejecting him as healer[67] — Yahweh as healer both makes and keeps his people well (Ex. 15:26).[68]

For the faithful, nevertheless, the notion of Yahweh as savior-healer of his people (Jer. 17:14) finds expression in many images: he heals those broken in heart as well as broken in body (Ps. 30:3[2]; 147:3), he restores the chosen people and their city (Jer. 30:17ff.), and he establishes enduring healing for Israel (Isa. 30:26; Ezk. 47:12; Mal. 3:20[4:2]) and the nations (Isa. 19:22). No earthly king or foreign god can compete with him (Hos. 5:13; 14:2-9[1-8]; 2 K. 1:1-6).[69]

V. 1. *LXX.* With few exceptions (e.g., Gen. 50:2, *entaphiastḗs;* Ezk. 34:4, *sōmatopoieín*), the LXX uses forms of *iásthai* to translated *rp';* only in Ezk. 47:8-11 is *hygiázein* used consistently.

2. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* At the time of writing, 8 occurrences of the root have been found in the Dead Sea Scrolls (3 instances of the verb, 5 of *marpē'*). The visitation of all those who follow the promptings of the spirit leads to healing *(lmrp')* and abundant peace (1QS 4:6), just as the Teacher of Righteousness, for whom chastisement and tor-

---

62. W. Foerster, "σωτήρ," *TDNT,* VII, 1004-5.

63. *Ibid.,* 990.

64. K. L. Tallqvist, *Akkadische Götter-Epitheta* (Helsinki, 1974), 317, 369-70, etc.; W. G. Lambert, *Or* 36 (1967) 120-21; also Jayne, 117-28; Baudissin, 310ff.

65. H. Grapow, *Grundriss,* III, 138ff.; H. Brunner, *LexÄg,* II, 645-47; Jayne, 52-86.

66. See III.2 above.

67. See III.4 above.

68. See II above.

69. A 6th/7th-century prayer to Yahweh as *hrwp' kl-h'rṣ* asks for "a healing [*rpwy*] and cure [*'sw*] for Eliezer" (Naveh and Shaked, *Amulets,* 50, 55 (amulet 3, 19-20). The Syriac Christians call Jesus *'āsyā' ṭāḇā',* "the good physician."

ment became eternal healing (*lmrpʾ,* 1QH 9:25), will become healing *(wmrpʾ)* for all who turn from sin (1QH 2:8).[70] God will heal *(trpʾnw)* those who pray of *šiggāʿôn, ʿiwwārôn,* and *timmāhôn* of heart (4QDibHam[a] frs. 1-2, 2:14; cf. the triad in Dt. 28:28).

Contrariwise, the princes of Judah hope in vain for healing (CD 8:4); the absence of healing and a physician is bewailed in 1QH 2:26 *(lʾyn mrpʾ)* and 4Q509 frs. 12-13, 4 *(wʾyn rwpʾ).* Finally, the root occurs once in disciplinary regulations governing desecration of the sabbath (CD 12:5).

A connection between the Qumran Essenes and the Egyptian Therapeutai has often been proposed.[71]

Brown

---

70. On the vague reference to Isa. 53:5 and the general interpretation of this passage, see Michaud, 414-15.

71. See G. Vermes, *Post-biblical Jewish Studies* (Leiden, 1975), 8-36; also more recently O. Betz, *TRE,* X, 386-91; J. Maier, *Zwischen den Testamenten. NEB* Erg. 3 zum AT (1990), 174-75.

רְפָאִים *rᵉpāʾîm*

I. 1. OT Occurrences; 2. Extrabiblical Occurrences; 3. Ancient Versions; 4. Etymology. II. Ugarit. III. Israel: 1. Inhabitants of the Netherworld; 2. Aboriginal People.

---

rᵉpāʾîm. E. Ashley, "The 'Epic of AQHT' and the 'RPUM Texts'" (diss., New York University, 1977); R. D. Barnett, "Sireus and Rephaim," *FS A. Mellink* (1986), 112-19; A. Caquot, "Rephaïm," *DBS,* X, 344-57; *idem,* "Les Rephaim ougaritiques," *Syr* 37 (1960) 75-93; A. Cooper, "Divine Names and Epithets in the Ugaritic Texts," *RSP,* III, 333-469, esp. 460-67; *idem,* "*MLK ʿLM:* 'Eternal King' or 'King of Eternity'?" *Love and Death in the Ancient Near East. FS M. H. Pope* (Guilford, Conn., 1987), 1-7; M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, "Baal *rpu* in KTU 1.108; 1.113 und nach 1.17 VI 25-33," *UF* 12 (1980) 171-82; M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín, "Die ugaritischen Totengeister *Rpu(m)* und die biblische Rephaim," *UF* 8 (1976) 45-52; H. Gese, "Der Tod im AT," *Zur biblischen Theologie. BEvT* 78 (1977) 31-54; J. F. Healey, "Death, Underworld and Afterlife in the Ugaritic Texts" (diss., London, 1977); W. J. Horwitz, "The Significance of the Rephaim, *rm.aby.btk.rpim,*" *JNSL* 7 (1979) 37-43; O. Kaiser (and E. Lohse), *Tod und Leben* (Stuttgart, 1977), esp. 7-80; P. Karge, *Rephaim* (Paderborn, ²1925); B. A. Levine and J.-M. de Tarragon, "Dead Kings and Rephaim," *JAOS* 104 (1984) 649-59; T. J. Lewis, *Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit. HSM* 39 (1989); C. E. L'Heureux, *Rank Among the Canaanite Gods. HSM* 21 (1979); *idem,* "The Ugaritic and Biblical Rephaim," *HTR* 67 (1974) 265-74; O. Loretz, "Vom kanaanäischen Totenkult zur jüdischen Patriarchen- und Elternverehrung," *JARG* 3 (1978) 149-204; V. Maag, "Tod und Jenseits nach dem AT," *Schweizerische theologische Umschau* 34 (1964) 17-37 = *Kultur, Kulturkontakt und Religion. FS V. Maag* (Göttingen, 1980), 181-202; R. Martin-Achard, *From Death to Life* (Eng. trans. Edinburgh, 1960); J. C. de Moor, *An Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit. Nisaba* 16 (Leiden,

I. 1. *OT Occurrences.* The noun *r^epā'îm* appears in two groups of texts. In poetic passages (Isa. 14:9; 26:14,19; Ps. 88:11[Eng. 10]; Job 26:5; Prov. 2:18; 9:18; 21:16), it refers to the dead; only forms in the absolute appear, all of which, except Job 26:5, are anarthrous. In narrative contexts (Gen. 14:5; 15:20; Dt. 2:11,20 [twice]; 3:11,13; Josh. 12:4; 13:12; 17:15; cf. 1 Ch. 20:4), it denotes an element of the aboriginal population. Syntactically, the noun is also in the absolute in these passages (with the article in Gen. 15:20 and Josh. 12:4), but sometimes as part of a construct phrase (Dt. 2:20; 3:13, *'ereṣ r^epā'îm;* Josh. 17:15, *b^e'ereṣ happ^erizzî w^ehār^epā'îm;* Dt. 3:11; Josh. 13:12, *yeṯer hār^epā'îm;* 1 Ch. 20:4, *y^eliḏê hār^epā'îm*). The noun *r^epā'îm* also enters into construct phrases that express a geographical location: the valley of Rephaim *('ēmeq r^epā'îm)* appears in Josh. 15:8; 18:16; 2 S. 5:18,22; 23:13; Isa. 17:5; 1 Ch. 11:15; 14:9.

Comparison of 1 Ch. 20:4 and 2 S. 21:18 allows us to derive the plural forms from singulars. The latter has *rāp̱â* (with article) instead of *r^epā'îm* in the parallel 1 Ch. 20:4, in both cases with the root *yld.* A similar observation holds for 2 S. 21:16,20,22: the corresponding texts in Chronicles (1 Ch. 20:6 = 2 S. 21:20; 1 Ch. 20:8 = 2 S. 21:22) have the form *rāp̱ā'* (with article), consonant with spelling the noun *r^epā'îm.*

2. *Extrabiblical Occurrences.* a. *Phoenician and Neo-Punic.* The noun *rp'm* in Phoenician also suggests the realm of the dead. The coffin inscription of Tabnit, king of Sidon, dating probably from the beginning of the 5th century B.C.E., threatens that whoever violates the king's grave will die without issue and have no resting place among the dead *(mškb 't rp'm).*[1] A similar warning appears in the coffin inscription of King Eshmunazar, only slightly later;[2] the added statement that whoever disturbs the repose of the king's corpse will go unburied *('l yqbr bqbr)* confirms that *rp'm* refers to the dead. Both texts establish a connection between the treatment of the dead and the assurance of offspring.

The first line of a Latin/Neo-Punic bilingual from El Amruni (1st century C.E.)[3] reads (depending on its reconstruction) *l'l[nm] 'r'p'm* ("to the divine Rephaim") or *l'l[n]' r'p'm* ("to the gods of the Rephaim").[4] The analogy of the Ugaritic *rp'm* texts[5]

1987); *idem, "Rāpi'ūma — Rephaim," ZAW* 88 (1976) 323-45; T. Podella, *Ṣôm-Fasten. AOAT* 224 (1989), esp. 73-116; M. H. Pope, "Notes on the Rephaim Texts from Ugarit," *Essays on the Ancient Near East in Memory of J. J. Finkelstein* (Hamden, Conn., 1977), 163-82; S. Ribichini and P. Xella, "Milk'aštart, *mlk(m)* e la tradizione siropalestinese sui Refaim," *RSF* 7 (1979) 145-58; D. J. Ryan, *Rpum and Rephaim* (1954); F. Schwally, *Das Leben nach dem Tode* (1892); *idem,* "Ueber einige palästinische Völkernamen," *ZAW* 18 (1898) 126-48; W. Speyer, "Heros," *RAC,* XIV, 861-77; K. Spronk, *Beatific Afterlife in Ancient Israel and in the Ancient Near East. AOAT* 219 (1986), with bibliog.; S. Talmon, "The Biblical Rephaim and the *rpu/i(m)* in the Literature of Ugarit," *BethM* 30 (1984/85) 16-27 (Heb.) = *FS R. Gordis. HAR* 7 (1984) 235-49 [Eng.]; L. Wächter, *Der Tod im AT. AzT* II/8 (1967), esp. 181-98.

→ רפא *rāpā'.*

1. *KAI,* 13.8.
2. *KAI,* 14.8.
3. *KAI,* 117.
4. J. Friedrich, *AfO* 10 (1935/36) 83.
5. See below.

and the Latin equivalent support the former.[6] The Latin section renders *lʾl[nm] ʾrʾpʾm* as *D(is) M(anibus) SAC(rum):* the grave is "dedicated to the minor deities," whose chthonic activity extends also to the living.[7]

b. *Ugaritic.* In 1970 it could be asserted confidently that the Ugaritic term *rpʾ(m)* had no direct association with the dead and the OT *rᵉpāʾîm.*[8] Since then, a text discovered in 1973 has strongly suggested interpreting the *rpʾm* as deified and cultically worshiped (royal) ancestors.[9] Years previously, the discovery of a fragmentary text[10] containing the noun *rpʾm,* glossed (as in the El Amruni inscription) as *ʾlnym,* "divinities, minor deities,"[11] *ʾlm,* "gods," and *mtm,* "the dead," had encouraged the understanding of the *rpʾm* as the numinous departed or shades of the dead.[12]

The language of other texts is harder to interpret. One group comprises the so-called Rephaim Texts,[13] fragmentary tablets whose mutual relationship is unclear.[14] Above all, the meaning of the phrase *rpu bʿl* is disputed.[15] An equally complex problem is the identity of the *rpi ʾrṣ,* mentioned in a text[16] that looks for the prosperity of Ugarit, which someone called *rpʾ mlk ʿlm* is in a position to bring about.[17]

There is no recent, complete compendium of the usages of the lexeme *rpʾ(m).* Cooper merely cites textual examples;[18] other lists of occurrences were published before recently discovered texts became available.[19] In recent years more individual texts that mention the *rpʾm* have been translated and analyzed, some with transcriptions,[20] or discussed in connection with the OT *rᵉpāʾîm.*[21]

3. *Ancient Versions.* Because the OT evidence is limited and disparate, we must investigate not only the extrabiblical parallels but also the ancient versions, etymology, and word formation to achieve an understanding of the *rᵉpāʾîm.*

The LXX offers little help in categorizing the occurrences. It uses *gígantes* ("giants")

---

6. *KAI,* 117; but cf. F. Vattioni, *Helikon* 20/21 (1980/81) 297-98.
7. On the meaning of Lat. *manes* see G. Radke, *Die Götter Altitaliens* (Münster, ²1979), 197.
8. A. van Selms, *UF* 2 (1970) 367-68.
9. *KTU,* 1.161.
10. *KTU,* 1.6, VI, 45-49.
11. J. C. de Moor, *The Seasonal Pattern in the Ugaritic Myth of Baʿlu. AOAT* 16 (1971), 241-42; Healey, 181-82.
12. E. Dhorme, *L'Evolution religieuse d'Israël,* I, *La religion des Hébreux nomades* (Brussels, 1937), 123; later see esp. Caquot, "Rephaim ougaritiques."
13. *KTU,* 1.20-22.
14. For a more recent attempt to establish an ordered sequence, see M. Dijkstra, *UF* 20 (1988) 35-51.
15. *KTU,* 1.22, I, 8; see below.
16. *KTU,* 1.108.
17. See below.
18. "Divine Names," 460-67.
19. *WUS,* no. 2527; *UT,* no. 2346; Whitaker, 575-76.
20. *TO,* I, 461-80; L'Heureux, *Rank,* 129-99; Spronk, 161-96; de Moor, *Anthology,* 98-99, 165-68, 187-90, 267-73.
21. Dietrich, Loretz, and Sanmartín; de Moor, "Rāpiʾūma"; Pope; Caquot, "Rephaïm."

both for the dead (Isa. 14:9; Job 26:5; Prov. 21:16) and for the aboriginal population (Gen. 14:5; Josh. 12:4; 13:12; 1 Ch. 20:4; cf. Gen. 15:20; Dt. 2:11,20; 3:11,13: *Raphaïn*). In Prov. 2:18 and 9:18, it uses *gēgeneís* ("earth-born"), a term associated with the giants in Greek tradition,[22] and in Isa. 26:14; Ps. 87:11(MT 88:11[10]), *iatroí* ("physicians").

Isa. 26:19 presents textual problems;[23] the LXX translates its conclusion idiosyncratically: instead of reading *wāʾāreṣ rᵉpāʾîm tappîl* ("and the earth will give birth to the Rephaim"), it reads *hē dé gḗ tṓn asebṓn peseítai* ("the land of the wicked will fall"), alluding to the commonplace of Greek mythology that the mighty giants are morally weak.[24] Tg. Jon. paraphrases the MT in the same vein. It makes God the subject of the verse, bringing the dead to life. The "dew of light" is bestowed only on those who are faithful to the law, whereas "the wicked *(ršyʿyʾ),* to whom you gave power *(gbwrʾ)* and who forsook your <word> *(mymrk),* you will consign to the <valley of Hinnom> *(gyhnm).*" In contrast to Aquila *(rhapheín)* and Theodotion *(gígantes),* Symmachus, likewise influenced by Hellenistic tradition, draws on the idea of theomachy and translates *rᵉpāʾîm* with *theomáchoi.*[25]

Like the LXX, the Vg. uses *gigantes* (Dt. 2:11,20; 3:11,13; Isa. 14:9; 26:14,19; Job 26:5; Prov. 9:18; 21:16), *medici* (Ps. 87:11[10], *Psalterium Gallicanum;* but cf. *Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos: gigantes*), and *impius* (Prov. 2:18); it also transliterates (Gen. 14:5; 15:20; Josh. 12:4; 13:12; 17:15, *Raphaim;* 1 Ch. 20:4, *Raphain*).

As a rule, the Tgs. use *g(y)bry.* Besides Isa. 26:19, the divergent translations of the Sam. Tg. are striking: it uses *ʾrʿ ʾshym/ʾsʾym* ("land of physicians"/"physicians") in Dt. 2:20 and *ʾrʿ ʾsʾym* ("land of physicians") in Dt. 3:13. Jerome also emphasized an association of *rᵉpāʾîm* with *medici.*[26]

The terminological evidence of the ancient versions, where the terms *gibbôrîm* and *gígantes* overlap, makes us aware of their underlying notions about heroes,[27] who were assumed in many senses to have stood supreme among the living and were therefore thought of as the "great deceased."[28] It was their function to vouchsafe help to those who came after, not least in their capacity as heroic healers[29] and bestowers of fertility.[30]

4. *Etymology.* Scholarship has appropriated the accurate exegetical insight that "death is understood as the feeblest form of life"[31] and applied it to the understanding of *rᵉpāʾîm,* interpreting the term as a nominalized plural adjective (sg. *rāpâ* or *rᵉpî*) de-

22. H. von Geisau, *KlPauly,* II, 715-16.
23. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1997), 556.
24. W. Speyer, *RAC,* X, 1248.
25. H.-J. Schoeps, *Bibl* 26 (1945) 100-103.
26. *Liber interpr. hebr. nom.* 23. 6 (*CCSL* 72 [1959], 87); see also Pirqe Rabbi Eliezer on Isa. 26:19.
27. F. Dexinger, *Sturz der Göttersöhne oder Engel von der Sintflut? WBTh* 13 (1966), 47-50, 61-67; R. Bartelmus, *Heroentum in Israel und seiner Umwelt. ATANT* 65 (1979), 114-16.
28. Speyer.
29. Speyer, 870; J. H. Croon, *RAC,* XIII, 1190-1232.
30. See, e.g., Hesiod, *Works and Days* 126.
31. Kaiser, 29.

rived from the root *rpy* and meaning "the feeble, powerless ones."[32] The word is claimed to function within this semantic framework, given the present form of the text (cf. *ḥly* in Isa. 14:10).

In light of the common orthographic assimilation of verbs *tertia aleph* and *tertia yod,*[33] it is noteworthy that — in contrast to *hārāpâ/hārāpāʾ* — forms of the noun *rᵉpāʾîm* are spelled invariably with *aleph.* As in the case of Ugar. *rpʾ(m),* this orthography suggests the root *rpʾ,* "heal."[34] This hypothesis is supported by the LXX translation of Isa. 26:14 and Ps. 87:11(88:10) and the Sam. Tg. on Dt. 2:20 and 3:13, although there is also early support for a connection with the root *rpy.*[35]

Attempts have been made to resolve the conflict between the two etymologies by proposing a single root with contrary meanings: the actual meaning would be determined by the intent and effect of text and context.[36] But because the *aleph* is always present, it seems more likely to think of a phenomenon involving homonymy rather than polysemy.[37] The word formation has little to contribute: according to the pointing of the MT, the word is a semantically unspecific *qaṭal* form. Also possible is an analogy-based formation, meant to suggest the negative implications of *rᵉšāʿîm,* "wicked, impious,"[38] or, less likely, the weakness associated with *ṭᵉlāʾîm,* "little lambs."[39]

In the El Amruni inscription, the Rephaim appear in the form *rʾpʾm,* in which the first *aleph,* used as a vowel sign, suggests an *o.*[40] This observation, the evidence of the versions, and etymological considerations, all point to the possibility that a *qāṭil* form was familiar, suggesting *rōpᵉʾîm,* "healers, physicians."[41] The OT Rephaim texts exhibit no trace of such a reading, at least not directly. But 2 Ch. 16:12 accuses King Asa of having turned to "physicians" *(rōpᵉʾîm)* in his sickness instead of to Yahweh. This charge makes sense only if we are dealing with a real antithesis, opposing Yahweh to another numinous healer.

II. Ugarit. Recently discovered Ugaritic texts have cast grave doubt on interpretations of the *rpʾm* as minor or major deities, an ethnic group, or living persons.[42] In *KTU,* 1.161 we have a description of a ritual[43] or a collection of ritual invocations[44] in which the de-

32. Schwally, 64-65; Karge, 622.
33. *BLe,* §54r.
34. As observed already by M.-J. Lagrange, *Études sur les religions sémitiques. ÉtB* (Paris, ²1905), 319: "an extension of the Athenian ἥρως ἰατρός."
35. Gen. Rab. 26:7 on Gen. 6:4; Bab. *Ket.* 111b on Isa. 26:14,19.
36. R. Gordis, *JQR* 27 (1936/37) 55-56.
37. B. Kedar, *Biblische Semantik* (Stuttgart, 1981), 121-34.
38. Caquot, "Rephaïm," 349.
39. De Moor, *"Rāpiʾūma,"* 341 n. 107.
40. J. Friedrich and W. Röllig, *Phönizisch-Punische Grammatik. AnOr* 46 (²1970), §107.4b.
41. De Moor, *"Rāpiʾūma,"* 340; Dietrich, Loretz, and Sanmartín, 47; Caquot, "Rephaïm," 349. On the possible interpretations of the nominal form *rpʾ(m)* see L'Heureux, "Ugaritic and Biblical Rephaim," 269-70.
42. See the bibliog. in Spronk, 161-62.
43. De Moor, *"Rāpiʾūma,"* 335.
44. W. T. Pitard, *BASOR* 232 (1978) 66.

parted members of the Ugaritic royal house are invoked and are offered sacrifice. In return they are expected to vouchsafe vitality *(šlm)* to the throne and the city of Ugarit. In ll. 11-12 ʿAmmurapi II, his dead father Niqmaddu III, and his grandfather ʿAmmištamru are invoked as *mlk,* "king," rather than *rp'm;* the latter term clearly refers to kings (and heroes?) who died long before.[45] The *rp'm* constitute a miscellaneous group; certain individuals are named, possibly to the extent that their names were known.[46] Together they are *rpi 'rṣ,* in parallel with *qbṣ dd*[*n*].[47] Since the "assembly of Didanu" refers to the deified founder of an Amorite dynasty preceding the kings of Ugarit,[48] the "*rpim* of the earth" are to be understood as inhabitants of the netherworld (cf. Akk. *erṣetu* and Heb. *'ereṣ*). The expression *rpim qdmym* refers collectively to all the "*rp'm* of ancient times."[49]

Despite the expectation that the *rp'm* should guarantee the continuity and security of the dynasty and its city, it is hard to decide whether the word *ẓlm* (cf. Akk. *ṣillu* and Heb. *ṣēl*) in the superscription of *KTU,* 1.161 *(spr dbḥ ẓlm)* is intended to refer to the *rp'm* as "protectors"[50] or (more likely) should be taken in the sense of "shades" = "spirits of the dead."[51] In any case the possible alternative calls into question the unconsidered use of the word "shades" for the dead; the same holds true for the OT term *rpā'îm,* the meaning of which such other equivalents as "spirits of the dead," "manes," and "dead souls"[52] can only approximate.

The function of the *rp'm* as healers, expressed by the extended context in *KTU,* 1.161, reappears more specifically in *KTU* 1.124, where the progenitor Didanu mentioned in *KTU,* 1.161 is called on to heal a child.[53]

On the evidence of the so-called Rephaim texts,[54] which even when reconstructed[55] resist interpretation as a coherent whole, it is quite likely that the *rp'm* were associated with the nurturing of the dead and with fertility.[56] This connection is illustrated by the provision of food for them and by their role in assuring offspring for King Danil.

In *KTU,* 1.20 they are invited into Danil's palace. As in several passages in the Aqhat Epic, Danil is referred to as *mt rp'* (cf. Heb. *'îš* [*hā*]*'elōhîm*), an expression that clearly means a "man of (the god) Rp'."[57] He is also a hero *(ǵzr).*[58] As is not uncom-

45. Levine and de Tarragon, 656.

46. Spronk, 190.

47. Ll. 2-3, 9-10; cf. *KTU,* 1.15, III, 13-15 = 2-4.

48. De Moor, *"Rāpi'ūma,"* 324.

49. L. 8.

50. W. T. Pitard, *BASOR* 232 (1978) 68; Levine and de Tarragon, 650-52; cf. *KTU,* 1.17, I, 28.

51. Cf. Ras Ibn Hani, no. 78, 20, 15 (J. C. de Moor, *UF* 12 [1980] 429-32); see the discussion, citing religio-historical parallels, by Spronk, 189 n. 3; Dietrich and Loretz, *UF* 19 (1987) 407-8.

52. Kaiser, 29ff.

53. Spronk, 193ff.

54. *KTU,* 1.20-22.

55. Spronk, 163-77.

56. Loretz, 168-69.

57. According to de Moor, *"Rāpi'ūma,"* 328, = Baal; for other interpretations see Caquot, "Rephaïm," 351.

58. *KTU,* 1.20, II, 18, together with *mtm* "the dead": *KTU,* 1.22, I,6-7; see A. F. Rainey, *Orient and Occident. FS C. H. Gordon. AOAT* 22 (1973), 142.

mon for numinous figures,[59] the *rp'm* travel in horse-drawn chariots; on the third day they reach "threshing floors and plantations,"[60] to partake in a festal banquet.

In *KTU,* 1.21, II, also, the *rp'm* are invited, probably by Danil, to enter a palace;[61] again we are told that they reach their destination on the third day. Especially problematic here is the form *mrzʿy,*[62] the reading of which is not certain.[63] On account of this uncertainty and the anomalous orthography (the usual Ugaritic form is *mrzḥ,* in syllabic texts *marziḫu;* cf. Heb. *marzēaḥ*), the problem of identifying the cultic institution denoted by Ugar. *mrzḥ*[64] and Heb. → מרזח *marzēaḥ* should be discussed without reference to this text.[65]

Another text[66] describes a banquet lasting seven days, which takes place in the "hall of the kings,"[67] words that likewise suggest viewing the *rp'm* as an exclusive group, an identification supported by the coordinate mention of *mtm,* "the dead,"[68] and *ġzrm,* "heroes."[69] Among the problems raised by this tablet is the statement *ṯm ṯmq rpu bʿl.*[70] The expression *rpu bʿl* has been interpreted variously: as a kind of hypostasis of Baal,[71] one "healed of Baal,"[72] and "the cure of Baal."[73] Others translate the expression as "the sovereign *Rpu*" and connect it with *ṯmq* as a proper noun.[74] Finally, Spronk[75] takes *ṯmq* as a verbal form (cf. Arab. *samaqu*) and *rp'* as an epithet of Baal:[76] "There rose up Baal Rapiu." On the analogy of the deity *bʿl mrp'* known in Phoenicia,[77] Baal might act on behalf of the dead as "Baʿlu the Saviour."[78]

A final important text describes how Baal, taking part in a meal connected with the cultic worship of the *rp'm,* also acts as the guarantor of success for the reigning king of Ugarit.[79] This interpretation assumes that it is Baal who functions as *rpu mlk ʿlm,* "the healer, the eternal king,"[80] rather than El[81] or Resheph (as "the healer, the king of eter-

---

59. De Moor, *Anthology,* 268 n. 279.
60. *KTU,* 1.20, II, 6-7.
61. But see M. Dijkstra, *UF* 20 (1988) 42.
62. Ll. 5, 9(?).
63. *CTA* 94 n. 1; *KTU, in loc.*
64. Spronk, 196-202.
65. → IX, 12.
66. *KTU,* 1.22, I.
67. Ll. 16-17.
68. L. 6.
69. L. 7.
70. L. 8.
71. C. Virolleaud, *RES* (1940) 78.
72. Caquot, "Rephaim ougaritiques," 90.
73. *TO,* I, 474.
74. Dietrich, Loretz, and Sanmartín, 49; followed by Caquot, "Rephaïm," 353.
75. P. 171.
76. Cf. Dietrich and Loretz.
77. *DISO,* 282.
78. De Moor, *Anthology,* 272.
79. *KTU,* 1.108.
80. Ll. 1,19-20,21,22. This is the interpretation of de Moor, "Rephaim," 329; Dietrich and Loretz; Spronk, 180.
81. L'Heureux, *Rank,* 170-71, 212-15.

nity" — i.e., the netherworld), or even the eponymous ancestor or head of the *rp'm,* not identified with any other known deity.[82]

In ll. 2-3 the attempt to read and interpret the text as *'l yṯb b'ṯtrt,* "the god enthroned with 'Athtartu," and *'l tpẓ bhd r'y,* "the god who judges with Haddu, the shepherd,"[83] has been given up in favor of a reading *'ṯtrt* and *hdr'y,*[84] interpreted as toponyms.[85] Since *'ṯtrt* and *hdr'y* must refer to Ashtaroth and Edrei in Bashan, these localities, mentioned in *KTU,* 1.108 even though they are a good distance from Ugarit, must be considered a center of the (royal) ancestor cult;[86] or else the Baal of these sites "must be seen as a renowned manifestation of the *rpu,* known as far away as Ugarit."[87] We may assume on the basis of their geographical localization that analogous traditions were known in Israel as well.

III. Israel. The different meanings of Heb. *r^epā'îm* have led lexicographers to posit two lemmas. Gesenius lists *rāpā'* (pl. *r^epā'îm,* "shades") and *r^epā'î* (gentilic; pl. *r^epā'îm,* "Rephaites").[88] This division has been generally accepted,[89] not always in the same order.[90]

The hypothesis of two distinct roots raises the question of semantic development or influence. Two theories found early support: the view that originally the word denoted a population of giants banished to the netherworld, whose name was subsequently applied to all the dead;[91] and the idea that the reference to the dead must be taken as primary, and that from this meaning derived the gentilic usage with its secondary aspect of gigantic size.[92]

It is impossible to decide between these theories, not least because the "hero" concept suggested by the ancient versions became linked with the idea of powerful ancestors, so that an ancestor cult[93] could become interwoven with heroic ideology.[94]

Only in isolated passages does the OT evince the notion of the deified dead (1 S. 28:13; Isa. 8:19) in the substratum of Yahwism, which had to abandon the idea of the powerful dead with the renunciation of chthonic Baal (and with him the *rp'm*). For the

---

82. A. Jirku, *ZAW* 77 (1965) 82-83; B. Margulis, *JBL* 89 (1970) 301; S. B. Parker, *UF* 2 (1970) 249; idem, *UF* 4 (1972) 104.

83. De Moor, "Rephaim," 327, following C. Virolleaud, *Ugaritica* V (1968), 555.

84. Dietrich and Loretz, 173.

85. B. Margulis, *JBL* 89 (1970) 292.

86. De Moor, *Anthology,* 187.

87. Dietrich and Loretz, 179.

88. *GesTh,* 1301.

89. E.g., *GesB* 770; *HAL,* III, 1274-75; *BDB,* 952, with the reservation of a possible common root; but cf. J. Fürst, *Hebräisches und chaldäisches Handwörterbuch,* II (Leipzig, 1863), 383.

90. *GesB: r^epā'îm* I: aboriginal people; *r^epā'îm* II: the dead; *HAL* reverses the order.

91. J. G. von Herder, *Vom Geist der Ebräischen Poesie* in his *Sämtliche Werke,* ed. B. Suphan, IX (Berlin, 1879, ²1967), 367-68; B. Duhm, *Jesaja. HKAT* III/1 (²1902), 91.

92. Schwally, *Leben,* 64-65 n. 1; *idem,* "Völkernamen," 126, 133; Karge, 620-21.

93. Loretz, 149-201.

94. W. Speyer, *RAC,* IX, 1153.

"canonical" texts and their audience, the dead have no more share in the life of Israel than does the aboriginal population.

1. *Inhabitants of the Netherworld.* In contrast to the Ugaritic *rpʾm* texts, the OT admits no doubt that the Rephaim inhabit the realm of the dead. The context is unambiguous. In Isa. 26:14,19, and Ps. 88:11(10), *rᵉpāʾîm* parallels *mēṯîm,* "the dead," and in Prov. 2:18 *māweṯ,* "death." Their dwelling place is *šᵉʾôl,* "the netherworld," and *ʾᵃḇaddôn,* "place of destruction," in Job 26:6 and Ps. 88:12(11); in Prov. 9:18 they dwell in *ʿimqê šᵉʾôl,* "the depths of the netherworld." Traditio-historically, these texts are influenced by Canaanite mythology, which appears (and not by accident) in their context or background. This influence raises the problem of the Rephaim as a Canaanite theme.

In Job 26:5-14 v. 5 uses the verb *yᵉḥôlālû* of the Rephaim. It makes sense to translate the polal form as "are made to tremble."[95] But since the verb *ḥyl* oscillates in meaning between "tremble (with birth pangs)" and "bear" (Dt. 32:18), it is possible to hear overtones of a role played by the Rephaim in the birth of progeny. The verb *rpʾ* is also used in this sense (Gen. 20:17; 2 K. 2:21).

For Yahwism the departed possess no productive power, as Ps. 88 attests. This psalm, which has a Canaanite background,[96] speaks in v. 5(4) of "one who goes down to the Pit" as *geḇer ʾên-ʾᵉyāl,* "a man with no strength [NRSV 'help']." The question in v. 11(10), "Do you work wonders for the dead? Do the Rephaim [NRSV 'shades'] rise up to praise you?" is less an appeal to Yahweh to intervene[97] than a rhetorically formulated rejection of the contrary notion, which *KTU,* 1.22, I, 5 associates with El, using the same verb *(qym).*[98]

A transfer of mythological material may also be observed in wisdom literature. In Prov. 21:16 one who wanders from the way of understanding is promised rest in the *qᵉhal rᵉpāʾîm,* "assembly of the Rephaim." This verse thus supports syntagmatically the interpretation of the omnipresent plural ending *-îm* as a collective plural.[99]

When Prov. 2 cautions against the strange woman, it names the consequences of associating with her: "for her way[100] leads down to death, and her paths to the Rephaim" (v. 18). The parallelism of *māweṯ* and *rᵉpāʾîm* here suggests a possible association with the Ugaritic deity *mt* ("Death") and those in his sway, now transferred to the strange woman.[101] According to Prov. 9:18, the house of the foolish woman (so characterized because she is passionate and seductive) is the pit of the netherworld, whose inhabitants are the Rephaim.

The only OT text that speaks in some detail of the realm of the dead is Isa. 14:4b-21, a

95. *HAL,* I, 311.
96. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1989), 192.
97. *Ibid.,* 194.
98. Spronk, 171 n. 2.
99. Michel, 34-63.
100. *BHS.*
101. O. Loretz, *UF* 14 (1982) 147.

hymn celebrating the fall of a world ruler, which — like the comparable text Ezk. 28:12ff. — draws on Canaanite mythologoumena.[102] This hymn, which was not composed by Isaiah,[103] celebrates God's triumph over the conqueror of the peoples: instead of ascending to heaven, he is brought down to the netherworld. V. 9 tells how *šᵉʾôl* is stirred up, the *rᵉpāʾîm* (described asyndetically as *kol-ʿattûḏê ʾāreṣ*, "all the leaders of the earth") roused (*ʿwr*), and all the kings of the nations raised from their thrones.[104] As at Ugarit, the kings are introduced as Rephaim; in contrast to the Ugaritic conception, however,[105] at death they must surrender their full vitality (*ḥly*, v. 10; cf. Ezk. 28:9-10; Ps. 82:6-7).

Isa. 26:13-14 also envisions an aristocratic circle. The context (vv. 7-21) is a poem structured as a communal lament set within the so-called Isaiah apocalypse (postexilic).[106] After v. 13, which speaks of other "lords" (*ʾᵃḏōnîm*) besides Yahweh who rule (*bāʿal!*) the people, v. 14 declares apodictically: "The dead will not live (*mēṯîm bal-yiḥyû*), Rephaim will not rise (*rᵉpāʾîm bal-yāqumû*)." Here too we are dealing with a response to Canaanite royal ideology: the text denies to the dead the possibility of rising and regaining life like the *rpʾm*.[107]

Antithetical to v. 14 is the salvation oracle[108] in v. 19, a complex text.[109] It draws on the language of v. 14 but arrives at the opposite conclusion by omitting the negative particle *bal*. The subjects to whom life is promised are: *mēṯeyḵā*, "your dead"; *nᵉḇēlāṯî*, "my corpses"; *šōḵᵉnê ʿāpār*, "dwellers in the dust"; and, in the second half of the verse, the *rᵉpāʾîm*. The statement that the earth will give birth to (*npl* hiphil[110]) the Rephaim reverses the Ugaritic notion that the *rpʾm* enable the birth of progeny. However we interpret the notion of resurrection — as individual resurrection or as revival of Israel as a collective — the *rᵉpāʾîm* in this passage are no longer an exclusive group among the dead, but the inhabitants of the netherworld in general.

2. *Aboriginal People.* The OT notion of an aboriginal race of giants (e.g., Nu. 13:33) has been associated with the great Bronze Age dolmen tombs,[111] which were thought to have been constructed by particularly mighty builders.[112] This explanation, which is probably only partially accurate, finds some support in the importance the OT attaches to the graves of the patriarchs and the long-enduring Palestinian cult of the tombs of heroes.[113]

---

102. Spronk, 213-27.
103. O. Kaiser, *Das Buch Jesaja. ATD* XVIII (^{2}1983), 27ff.; H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1997), 53-56.
104. On the syntax and semantics of the verse see Wildberger, 440.
105. But see Spronk, 225-26, on the fate of King Keret.
106. Wildberger, 445-67.
107. See *KTU*, 1.22, I, 5; 1.17, VI, 30, 32-33.
108. Wildberger, 456-57.
109. Kaiser, *ATD* XVIII, 173-77; Wildberger, 556, 567-700.
110. Wildberger, 556.
111. A. Kuschke, *BRL*^{2}, 62.
112. Karge, 609ff.
113. Karge, 611; on Greece see J. N. Coldstream, *JHS* 96 (1976) 14.

King Og may have been identified as a hero. According to a sarcophagus inscription of the Achaemenid period, somewhat difficult to interpret,[114] his "strength" (*ʿdr*) belongs to the chthonic realm.

In contrast to Dt. 1:4 and Josh. 9:10, which name Ashtaroth (Tell Ashtara[115]) as Og's capital, and Josh. 12:4; 13:12,31, which like *KTU*, 1.108, 2-3 speak of Ashtaroth and Edrei (Derʿā[116]), the tradition of Dt. 3:11 associates Og with Rabbah of the Ammonites. The historical and mythological figures coalesce, linked by the reference to Og as "the last of the Rephaim" (*yeṯer hārᵉpāʾîm,* Dt. 3:11; Josh. 12:4; 13:12).

The Dtr History identifies the Rephaim as the aboriginal population of Transjordan (Dt. 2:10-11,20-21) and calls the fertile (Jer. 50:19; Mic. 7:14) territory of Bashan, which appears in both cosmic and chthonic contexts (Ps. 68:16,23[15,22]; cf. Jer. 22:20), "the land of the Rephaim" (Dt. 3:13; cf. Jub. 29:9ff.). On the other hand, Dt. 2:20 speaks of the land of the Ammonites in the same way, while Josh. 17:15 (*ʾereṣ happᵉrizzî wᵉhārᵉpāʾîm*) probably has in mind Cisjordan (cf. Josh. 17:16).

The antiquarian notes in Dt. 2:10-12,20-23 are intended to establish relationships between regions and ethnic groups. According to vv. 10-11, the Emim lived in Moab, a people as large and numerous (*ʿam gāḏôl wᵉraḇ wārām*) as the Anakim. Like the latter, they are reckoned (*ḥšb*) among the Rephaim. According to vv. 20-21, the land of the Ammonites is a land of the Rephaim, who formerly inhabited it, though the Ammonites called them Zamzummim. They too were as numerous and tall as the Anakim. In each case, like the vicinity of Ashtaroth, the region in question has a large number of dolmens.[117]

In the Deuteronomy text, "Rephaim" is a generic term for Zamzummim and Emim; Gen. 14:5 juxtaposes the Rephaim, Emim, and Zuzim (= Zamzummim?[118]) as coordinate ethnic groups.

We are dealing here not with historical memories but with a historicization of the posthumous state of aboriginal groups; for the names "Emim" and "Zamzummim," like "Rephaim," are to be understood as functional designations in pseudo-ethnic dress.[119] "Emim" (*hāʾēmîm*) recalls *ʾēmâ,* "fear"; like the Rephaim as "healers," the term can express an aspect of the ambivalent role played by the dead.[120] The name "Zamzummim" (*zamzummîm*) suggests a connection with → זמם *zmm,* "devise (evil)," or Arab. *zamzama,* "murmur, drone,"[121] with reference to voices from the realm of the dead (Isa. 8:19; 29:4).[122] Alternatively, the word has been likened to Gk. *bárbaros* as an onomatopoetic reduplicating form with the meaning "stammer-

114. W. Röllig, *NESE* 2 (1974) 1-15, esp. 5-6.
115. F.-M. Abel, *Géographie de la Palestine,* II (Paris, 1938), 155.
116. *Ibid.,* 310.
117. E. C. Broome, *JBL* 59 (1940) 479-97.
118. Cf. Symmachus: *Zoizommein.*
119. Caquot, "Rephaïm," 346.
120. Schwally, "Völkernamen," 135-37.
121. *HAL,* I, 273.
122. Schwally, "Völkernamen," 137-39.

ing."[123] At least in the case of the Emim, interpretation of the word as an appellative is supported by the form *hāʾēmîm,* in which the pl. suf. *-îm* rather than the relational suf. *-î* appears in combination with the article.[124] (Cf. Gen. 15:20: except for *rᵉpāʾîm,* the names of ethnic groups have the article and the suf. *-î.*)

There is also an association with the Rephaim in 2 S. 21:15-22. Two of the Philistine champions are called *yᵉlîdê hārāpâ* (vv. 16,18; 1 Ch. 20:8, *nûllᵉdû lᵉhārāpāʾ*), with the variant *yullad lᵉhārāpâ* (v. 20); all four together are called *yullᵉdû lᵉhārāpâ* (v. 22). The parallel in 1 Ch. 20:4 reads *yᵉlidê hārᵉpāʾîm,* indicating that *yᵉlîdê hārāpâ/yᵉlîdê hārāpāʾ* go together with *hārᵉpāʾîm.* Thus *hārāpâ* is to be understood as an eponym of the Rephaim.[125] That an article is intended is assumed in any case by the LXX in 2 S. 21:16,18,20,22; 1 Ch. 20:8 *(Rapha).* The article argues for an appellative meaning, which requires the root *rpʾ* rather than *rpy;* for 2 S. 15–21 bears the clear marks of a hero tradition[126] that understands the eponymous hero as a healer.[127]

Although 2 S. 21:15-22 is earlier than the Rephaim passages, it would be mistaken to conclude that the Rephaim tradition in Cisjordan deserves priority.[128] Cults of heroes and the dead are phenomena that are not limited geographically; furthermore, a Ugaritic text already locates such a cult in Transjordan in the Late Bronze Age.[129]

Another series of texts that associate the term "Rephaim" with the region west of the Jordan use the phrase *ʿēmeq rᵉpāʾîm* (Josh. 15:8; 18:16; 2 S. 5:18,22; 23:13; Isa. 17:5; 1 Ch. 11:15; 14:9). This valley is mentioned in the context of David's conflicts with the Philistines, who use it as a stronghold (2 S. 5:18,22; 23:13; 1 Ch. 11:15; 14:9), and in descriptions of borders that locate the boundary between Judah and Benjamin at the north end of the valley (Josh. 15:8; 18:16). Josephus's reference to the valley as being located twenty stadia (about 2 miles) from Jerusalem in the direction of Bethlehem[130] supports its identification with *el-baqʿa,* "the small valley."[131]

The valley's location near Jerusalem probably influenced its mention in a prophecy of disaster spoken by Isaiah against the northern kingdom of Israel (Isa. 17:4-6). V. 5 describes the harvest in the Valley of Rephaim, the largest wheat-growing area in the vicinity of Jerusalem,[132] to illustrate the total destruction awaiting Israel in case of a hostile attack.[133]

---

123. Caquot, "Rephaïm," 346; see H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch,* I (Heidelberg, ²1973), 219-20.

124. Meyer, III, §96,4c.

125. As already proposed by Schwally, "Völkernamen," 129; now Caquot, "Rephaïm," 345-446; for a different view see C. E. L'Heureux, *BASOR* 221 (1976) 83-85.

126. Bartelmus, *Heroentum,* 119, 128-30.

127. Speyer, 869-70.

128. J. R. Bartlett, *VT* 20 (1970) 268ff.; cf. Caquot, "Rephaïm," 345.

129. *KTU,* 1.108, 2-3.

130. *Ant.* 7.4.1; 12.4.

131. O. Keel and M. Küchler, *Orte und Landschaften der Bibel* II (Zurich, 1982), 596; for other proposals see Caquot, "Rephaïm," 345.

132. G. Dalman, *Jerusalem und sein Gelände. BFCT* II/19 (1930 = 1972), 212.

133. Wildberger, 171-72.

None of this explains the name of the valley. Whether this name is connected with megalithic remains thought of as the legacy of giants[134] or the fertility of the region,[135] reflecting the chthonic association of death and life,[136] cannot be decided with certainty. The ancient versions support both possibilities: the LXX thinks of the realm of death *(en phárаggi stereá,* while Tg. Jon. thinks of the realm of heroes *(bmyšr gybry');* the Vg. transliteration *in valle Raphaim* neutralizes the interpretations.

Liwak

134. Karge, 636.
135. Caquot, "Rephaïm," 345.
136. Pope, 174; S. Ribichini and P. Xella, *UF* 12 (1980) 434-37.

רָפָה *rāpâ;* רָפֶה *rāpeh;* רִפָּיוֹן *rippāyôn*

I. Root and Distribution. II. Occurrences: 1. Statistics; 2. Theological Contexts. III. Usage: 1. Literal Sense; 2. Idiomatic Usage; 3. Figurative Sense; 4. *rᵉpā'îm.* IV. LXX. V. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. Root and Distribution. The basic meaning of the verb *rph* is defined eloquently by Gesenius in his *Thesaurus* as "was loosed, was slack, collapsed,"[1] in his *Wörterbuch* as "sink down."[2] This basic meaning is confirmed by cognates in other Semitic languages (though not in Akkadian). In the Ugaritic epic of Aliyan Baal,[3] we read: "you would be attacked and drop *(ttrp*[4])"; the Dead Sea Scrolls frequently speak of weary or slack hands,[5] such as appears contemporaneously with the OT in the Lachish ostraca.[6] Aram. *rph* appears in the Barrakib inscription;[7] its meaning is given as "set free" (*whrpy*[8]), a sense that can be derived from the basic meaning given above.

Both in the OT and in Jewish Aramaic, we find orthographic variants ending with the consonant *'*,[9] which do not derive from the original root *rp'*.

rāpâ. G. Rinaldi, "RPH Salmo 46,11," *BibOr* 22 (1980) 54.

1. *GesTh,* 1303.
2. *GesB,* 770.
3. *KTU,* 1.5, I, 4.
4. *WUS,* no. 2531.
5. See V below.
6. 6:6; see III.3 below.
7. *KAI,* 215.8.
8. *KAI,* II, 224, 227.
9. See the discussion of *rᵉpā'îm* in III.4 below.

II. Occurrences. 1. *Statistics.* The verb *rph* occurs 14 times in the qal, twice in the niphal, 4 times in the piel, 3 times in the hithpael, and 25 times in the hiphil. There are 5 occurrences of the adj. *rāpeh* and 2 of the noun *rippāyôn* (including one each in Sirach). Derivatives include the noun *rᵉpā'îm,* with 8 occurrences. The PN *rāpâ* in 1 Ch. 8:37 cannot be associated with our verb, especially since it appears in 1 Ch. 9:43 written as *rᵉpāyâ.*[10]

2. *Theological Contexts.* The verb *rph* does not have particular theological relevance, although Yahweh is often its associated subject or object. In the majority of cases the context is a divine promise (Dt. 4:31; 31:6,8; Josh. 1:5; 1 Ch. 28:20; Zeph. 3:16); but we also find prayers for Yahweh's help (Josh. 10:6; Ps. 138:8) and requests to spare someone (2 S. 24:16; 1 Ch. 21:15; Job 7:19). The War Scroll from Qumran asserts that Yahweh strengthens the "slack hands" for battle.[11]

III. Usage. 1. *Literal Sense.* In most cases the subject or object is a hand *(yāḏ);* in this usage the expression is metaphorical.[12] Only in a few instances does *rph* refer to the literal "sinking" of something. Examples are Jgs. 19:9 *(hinnēh nā' rāpâ hayyôm la'ᵃrōḇ)* and Isa. 5:24 (the dry grass sinks down in the flame), as well as the description of the cherubim in Ezekiel's inaugural vision: they let down their wings when they stand still (Ezk. 1:24-25). Jgs. 8:3 describes the subsiding anger of the opponents: *'āz rāpᵉṯâ rûḥām.*

Job 12:21 stands on the borderline of metaphorical usage: Yahweh "pours contempt on princes, and looses [= 'drops'] the belt of the strong";[13] this expression stands for the rendering of the powerful powerless.

"Sunken down" (hithpael, niphal) in the physical or mental sense means "unable to work," either "lazy" (Ex. 5:8,17) or "slack" (Prov. 18:9, *miṯrappeh ḇimᵉla'ḵtô;* Josh. 18:3, *miṯrappîm lāḇô';* in Prov. 24:10 the opposite of such an attitude is *kōaḥ*).

2. *Idiomatic Usage.* a. *With ḥzq.* Idiomatic usage of the root *rph* includes the many occurrences of the antonymic pair *rph/ḥzq*[14] in encouragement addressed to Joshua (Dt. 31:6), Solomon (1 Ch. 28:20), and Asa of Judah (2 Ch. 15:7); here and in the semantically similar texts Dt. 31:8 and Josh. 1:5, *rph* hiphil is followed by the synonymous *lō' 'zb* (in Dt. 4:31, *šḥt*).

The idiomatic combination appears also in proverbial wisdom: "I hold fast *(heḥᵉzaqtî)* my integrity and will not let it go *('arpehā)*" (Job 27:6);[15] "Hold fast *(haḥᵃzēq)* to discipline and do not let (it) go *('al-terep)*" (Prov. 4:13); Sir. 6:27 calls on the reader to search out wisdom, "and when you get hold of her *(whḥqth),* do not let her

---

10. See *BHS, in loc.*
11. See V below.
12. See III.3 below.
13. Following F. Horst, *Hiob. BK* XVI/1 (³1974), 177, 195.
14. → IV, 301-8.
15. Following G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (²1989), 327.

go *(w'l trph)*."[16] In Cant. 3:4 the young lover means her words literally: "I grasped him *('ḥz)* and would not let him go *(wᵉlō' 'arpennû)*."

The contrastive adjective pair *rāpeh/ḥāzāq* appears in Moses' charge to the spies to find out whether the inhabitants of the land of Canaan are strong *(ḥāzāq)* or weak *(rāpeh)* (Nu. 13:18) and also in the promise that "weak hands" will be made "strong" (Isa. 35:3; Job 4:3).[17]

b. *Other.* Another idiomatic usage of *rph* (hiphil) is in combination with *min* (Dt. 9:14; Jgs. 11:37; Ps. 37:8; also Ex. 4:26 [qal]), *lᵉ* (1 S. 11:3; 2 K. 4:27), sometimes an accusative (Job 7:19; Sir. 51:10), or absolutely (1 S. 15:16; Ps. 46:11[Eng. 10]). Semantically related to these texts are the utterances *'al-terep yādêkâ mē'ᵃbādêkā* (Josh. 10:6) and *herep yādekā* (2 S. 24:16 par. 1 Ch. 21:15); in the former, *yād* stands for Yahweh's intervention to help, in the latter, to punish.

There are other texts besides those already mentioned[18] where the hiphil of *rph* takes an accusative object. In Ps. 138:8 the psalmist prays, "Do not forsake the work of your hands";[19] in Neh. 6:3 Nehemiah asks whether he should stop his work.[20]

3. *Figurative Usage.* Drooping hands are a common image expressing discouragement or fatigue; here we find the verb *rph* qal and piel, as well as the adj. *rāpeh* and the noun *rippāyôn.* Here it will suffice to list the texts and the subjects involved: 2 S. 4:1 (Ishbaal); 17:2 (David); Isa. 13:7 (like Jer 50:43: Babylon on the "day of Yahweh"); 35:3; Jer. 6:24; 38:4.

(In the case of Jer. 38:4, Lachish ostracon VI should be cited, since it employs the same idiom: *whnh dbry h*[. . .] *l' ṭbm lrpt ydyk,* "and behold, the words of the of[ficials] are not good, (but) to make your hands slack."[21] According to Conrad,[22] *lrpt ydym* also has the military sense of "demobilize," as is shown by its opposite in Arad ostracon 88.2: *'mṣ* [piel] *zrw'.* It describes the same situation as the Jeremiah passage.[23])

Other passages include Jer. 47:3 (the Philistines); 49:24 (Damascus; here the word *yād* is not present, so that *rph* is used absolutely[24]); Ezk. 7:17; 21:12(7) (Jerusalem); Zeph. 3:16 (encouraging Jerusalem: *'al-tîrā'î . . . 'al-yirpû yādāyik*); 2 Ch. 15:7 (the prophet Azariah ben Oded similarly encourages Asa of Judah); Job 4:3. Neh. 6:9 recounts the attempts of Nehemiah's political opponents to intimidate him (cf. Ezr. 4:4). In Sir. 4:29 we read: "Do not be boastful with your tongue, but slack *(rpy)* and subdued *(ršš)* in your deed";[25] in 25:23: "Drooping hands *(rpywn ydym)*

---

16. Following G. Sauer, *JSHRZ* III/5, 520.
17. See III.3 below.
18. See above.
19. Following H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1989), 505.
20. On Sir. 6:27 see III.2.a above.
21. *KAI,* 196.5-6.
22. D. Conrad, *TUAT,* I/6 (1985), 624.
23. J. B. Pritchard, *Archaeology and the OT* (Princeton, 1958), 10-18, esp. 17.
24. See III.2.b above.
25. G. Sauer, *JSHRZ* III/5, 516.

and weak knees *(kšlwn brkym)* come from the wife who does not make her husband happy."[26]

4. *r^epā'îm.* In his *Thesaurus,*[27] Gesenius considers the possibility that the noun *r^epā'îm* (II) might derive from the adj. *rāpeh; GesB* presents this etymology as commonly accepted: "usually considered the plural of רָפֶה, slack."[28] *HAL,* with some reservations, lists the noun among the derivatives of *rph.*[29]

The "departed"[30] or "dead spirits"[31] dwelling in *š^e'ôl* as "sunken" or "weak" shades are mentioned in Isa. 14:9; 26:14,19. In the Psalms and in sapiential proverbs (Ps. 88:11[10]; Prov. 2:18; 9:18; 21:16), the dwelling place of the *r^epā'îm* generally stands for the downfall of fools. For Job 26:5 many scholars (with LXX) find a reference to the giants discussed under *r^epā'îm* (I).

IV. LXX. Because the usage of the root *rph* is highly varied and often idiomatic, the LXX does not offer a uniform equivalent. Most common are compounds of *lýein,* such as *eklýein* (Josh. 10:6; 18:3; 2 S. 4:1; 17:2; 2 Ch. 15:7; Ezr. 4:4; Neh. 6:9; Isa. 13:7; Jer. 38:4; 49:24; Ezk. 7:17 [Jer. 47:3: *éklysis*]) and *paralýein* (Jer. 6:24; 50:43; Ezk. 21:12[7]). We also find forms of *aniénai* (Jgs. 8:3; 1 S. 11:3; 15:16; 2 S. 24:16 par. 1 Ch. 21:15; 1 Ch. 28:20; Isa. 5:24; 35:3), *enkataleípein* (Dt. 4:31; Josh. 1:5), and *katapaúein* (Ezk. 1:24). The adj. *rāpeh* in Ex. 5:8,17 and the verb *rph* in Ps. 46:11(10) are rendered with *scholázein* and *scholastḗs,* respectively.

V. Dead Sea Scrolls. The Dead Sea Scrolls follow the OT usage of *rph.* In 1QpHab 7:11 we read of "the men of truth, who fulfill the law, whose hands do not grow weary *(lō' yirpû y^edêhem)* from serving the truth when the final age is extended beyond them,"[32] while 1QM 14:6 (as well as the earlier recension 4QM^a frs. 8-10, 1:4[33]) asserts that God trains frail hands *(ydym rpwt)* in war. Sir. 6:27 (Heb.) is echoed in 2QSir 2:8; the texts 4Q176 fr. 30, 3 and 4Q502 fr. 44, 2 are fragmentary and uncertain.

Beyse

26. *Ibid.,* 568.
27. *GesTh,* 1302.
28. *GesB,* 770.
29. *HAL,* III, 1275.
30. *GesB,* 770.
31. *HAL,* III, 1275.
32. E. Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran* (Munich, ²1971), 237.
33. C.-H. Hunzinger, *ZAW* 69 (1957) 135-36.

רָצָה rāṣâ; רָצוֹן rāṣôn

I. West Semitic. II. Statistics. III. Verb: 1. Qal; 2. Other Conjugations; 3. *rṣh* II. IV. Noun. V. Names. VI. Dead Sea Scrolls. VII. LXX.

I. West Semitic. The lexeme *rṣw/y* is attested only in West Semitic. Akk. *tarṣētum* is probably a West Semitic loanword.[1] In Arabic the verb *raḍiya,* "be pleased, content," is found, along with a series of derived nouns.[2] There is also a South Arabic *rḍw/y.*[3] In Syriac and Aramaic the lexeme *r*'' II is used with a similar meaning.[4]

In the other West Semitic languages, *rṣw/y* is very rare.[5] One occurrence in Palmyrene[6] may be ignored.[7] The Ugaritic evidence is likewise unclear. The reading *wyrṣ lkl*[8] is disputed.[9] The PN *rṣn*[10] is possible but not certain.[11] Amor. *rṣ* may be considered certain.[12] The Amarna letters are discussed elsewhere.[13]

II. Statistics. The verb *rṣh* occurs 59 times, the noun *rāṣôn,* 56. There are 44 occurrences of the qal (13 in Psalms; 4 in Leviticus; 3 each in 1 Chronicles, Job, Proverbs, Ezekiel, and Malachi; 2 each in Deuteronomy, 2 Chronicles, and Jeremiah; 1 each in Genesis, 2 Samuel, Esther, Hosea, Amos, Micah, Haggai, and Ecclesiastes), 7 of the niphal (6 in Leviticus; Isa. 40:2), and 1 each of the piel (Job 20:10), hithpael (1 S. 29:4), and hiphil (Lev. 26:34). Dahood's proposed reading of the infinitive absolute of

---

rāṣâ. A. Bonora, "L'enigmatico proverbio di Pr 14,9," *RivB* 36 (1988) 61-66; G. Gerleman, "רצה *rṣh* Gefallen haben," *THAT,* II, 810-13; I. Matsuda, "The Structure of Mental Activities in Biblical Hebrew," *AJBI* 2 (1976) 79-99; R. Rendtorff, "Priesterliche Kulttheologie und prophetische Kultpolemik," *TLZ* 81 (1956) 339-42; *idem, Studien zur Geschichte des Opfers im Alten Israel. WMANT* 24 (1967), esp. 253-60; G. Segalla, "La volontà di Dio nei LXX, in rapporto al TM: θέλημα, *rāṣôn, ḥēfeṣ,*" *RivB* 13 (1965) 121-43; *idem,* "La volontà di Dio in Qumran," *RivB* 11 (1963) 379-95.

1. *AHw,* III, 1331.
2. Wehr, 344.
3. Beeston, 115; Biella, 494-95; G. L. Harding, *An Index and Concordance of Pre-Islamic Arabian Names and Inscriptions* (Toronto, 1971), 280.
4. *LexSyr,* 738.
5. For Aramaic see *WTM,* IV, 464-66; Jastrow, 1493.
6. H. Ingolt *et al., Recueil des Tessères de Palmyre* (Paris, 1955), 991a.
7. *PNPI,* 50, 112.
8. Cited by *UT,* no. 2340.
9. Despite M. Dahood, *Ugaritic-Hebrew Philology. BietOr* 16 (1965), 47, 72; and *CML*²; cf. *KTU,* 1.16, I, 45.
10. *UT,* no. 2349; *KTU,* 4.370, 16.
11. See V below.
12. *APNM,* 265; I. J. Gelb, *Computer-Aided Analysis of Amorite. AS* 21 (1980), 30, 347.
13. D. Sivan, *Grammatical Analysis and Glossary of the Northwest Semitic Vocables in Akkadian Texts of the 15th-13th Centuries B.C. from Canaan and Syria. AOAT* 214 (1984), 165.

rṣh in Hos. 4:2 remains uncertain.[14] There are 14 occurrences of the noun in Proverbs, 13 in Psalms, 7 in Leviticus, 6 in Isaiah, 4 in Daniel, 2 each in Deuteronomy, Nehemiah, and Esther, and 1 each in Genesis, Exodus, 2 Chronicles, Ezra, Jeremiah, and Malachi.

III. Verb.

1. *Qal.* The basic meaning of the verb is best defined as "be pleased with, find good or pleasant, love, like, wish for," etc. The treatment of *rṣh* in the LXX attests to its range of meanings.[15]

Important synonyms include → אבה *'āḇâ,* "be willing"; → אוה *'wh* piel and hithpael, "desire"; → אהב *'āhaḇ,* "love"; → בחר *bāḥar,* "choose"; → ברך *brk,* "bless"; → חמד *ḥāmad̲,* "desire, take pleasure in"; → *māṣā' ḥēn*[16] *bᵉ'ênê,* "be pleasing in the eyes of" (when *ḥēn* is discussed, the meaning "grace" is often mistakenly emphasized; Lande has rightly pointed out, however, that the basic meaning of *ḥēn* is not really "grace" but "that which makes pleasant"[17]); → חפץ *ḥāpēṣ,* "delight in"; *yṭb bᵉ'ênê, yṭb lip̄nê,* "please";[18] → ידע *yāda',* "know"; → ישע *yš',* "save, help, deliver"; *yāšar bᵉ'ênê,* "please";[19] → כבד *kāḇēd̲,* "honor"; *ḥbb,* "love";[20] → נטה *nāṭâ,* "be inclined toward"; → נצל *nṣl,* "deliver"; → עזר *'āzar,* "help"; → ערב *'rb* III, "be pleasing"; → עתר *'tr niphal,* "be entreated"; → רחם *rḥm,* "love," piel "have mercy"; *špr 'l,* "please." Like its nominal derivative, the verb *rṣh* is relatively uncommon in the context of human relationships.[21]

The use of *rṣh* in Dt. 33, probably an early text, is characteristic. V. 11 records the blessing of the tribe of Levi: "Bless [*brk*], O Yahweh, his substance, and take pleasure in the work of his hands [*ûp̄ō'al yāḏāyw tirṣeh*])." And v. 24 promises that the tribe of Asher will be "the favorite of his brothers [*yᵉhî rᵉṣûy 'eḥāyw*]." As the context shows, these utterances are associated closely with the notion of Yahweh's blessing.[22] Here being favored means prosperity, success, etc.; it is considered the result of God's blessing. The close connection between *rṣh* and *brk* is also illustrated by the use of *rāṣôn*[23] and *bᵉrāḵâ* in parallel in v. 23, which describes Naphtali: "Naphtali is sated with favor [*rāṣôn*] and full of *birkaṯ yhwh.*"[24] Est. 10:3, a very late text, describes Mordecai as being "very popular with all his kinsmen [*wᵉrāṣûy lᵉrōḇ 'eḥāyw*]." Here the connection with the deity is not expressed directly but is implicit.

---

14. M. Dahood, *Proverbs and Northwest Semitic Philology* (Rome, 1963), 54.
15. See VII below.
16. → חנן *ḥānan.*
17. I. Lande, *Formelhafte Wendungen der Umgangssprache im AT* (Leiden, 1949), 95.
18. *HAL,* I, 340.
19. → ישר *yāšar* III.5.a.
20. *HAL,* I, 284.
21. See IV below.
22. C. W. Mitchell, *The Meaning of brk "to bless" in the OT. SBLDS* 95 (1987), 16, 67, 89, 117, 167, 169, etc.
23. See IV below.
24. Mitchell, *Meaning,* 89, 167.

The verb *rṣh* can also express the love of the king and the people for the Jerusalem temple and for Zion. In the Chronicler's history of the building of the temple, David says: "Because of my love [*birṣôṯî*] for the house of my God, I give gold and silver out of my treasure" (1 Ch. 29:3). Ps. 102:15(Eng. 14) says that those who worship Yahweh hold the stones of Zion dear *(kî-rāṣû ʿᵃḇādêḵā ʾeṯ-ʾᵃḇānêhā).* "Even as a city of ruins, Zion remains the sanctuary of God."[25]

The semantic range of the lexeme is illustrated by 2 Ch. 10:7. Here, in the story of Rehoboam's coronation, *rṣh* is used in the sense of "oblige the people [*ûrᵉṣîṯām*]." In the Psalms, too, *rṣh* is used to describe human relationships.

Ps. 50:18(17) is disregarded here, since the form *wattireṣ* probably comes from *rûṣ;* thus LXX, Syr., and Tg. read *wattārоṣ.*[26] Ps. 62 is an individual lament and petition that is hard to date; v. 5(4) says of the psalmist's enemies: "They take pleasure in falsehood [*yirṣû kāzāḇ*]" (MT is very uncertain; here too LXX and Syr. read *yāruṣû*). Ps. 49:14(13) also uses *rṣh* for a human situation. The text of this sapiential psalm is poorly preserved; here it describes the end of "those who delight in great words [*bᵉpîhem yirṣû*]."[27]

A frequency analysis shows that wisdom literature is particularly apt to use *rṣh* to describe human relationships. In Prov. 3:12, for example, we read: "The one Yahweh loves he reproves, as a father the son in whom he delights [*ûḵᵉʾāḇ ʾeṯ-bēn yirṣeh*]." And Prov. 23:26 (unless we read *Q tiṣṣōrnâ,* with LXX, Syr., Vg., Tg., and many comms.) contains the exhortation: "Give me your heart, my son, and let your eyes delight in my ways [*wᵉʿênêḵā dᵉrāḵay tirṣenâ; K*]." In Job 14:6 (the context voices Job's thoughts on the transitory human condition), Job wishes that God would let a person alone, "that he might at least like a day laborer enjoy his day [*ʿaḏ-yirṣeh kᵉśāḵîr yômô*]." In the story of Jacob's reconciliation with Esau, Jacob says to his brother: "You look on me with pleasure [*wattirṣēnî*]" (Gen. 33:10). Here *rṣh* appears together with the idiom *māṣāʾ ḥēn bᵉʿênê.*[28]

All other occurrences of *rṣh* have God as subject, directly or indirectly. For example, Yahweh's pleasure can be directed toward particular individuals whom he calls. According to 1 Ch. 28:4, David was chosen to be king because Yahweh took delight in him *(rṣh).* In the first of the Servant Songs (Isa. 42:1), Yahweh speaks through the prophet, describing his servant: "my chosen, in whom I delight [*rāṣᵉṯâ napšî*]." In these two passages, then, there is a connection between God's election[29] and *rṣh.*

But the experiences of everyday life in ancient Israel also reflect the great importance of Yahweh's *rṣh.* Elihu accuses Job of saying: "It profits nothing to be on good terms with God [*birṣōṯô ʿim-ʾᵉlōhîm*]" (Job 34:9). But Job's assertion that devotion is futile stands in stark contrast to the traditional understanding of Yahweh's *rṣh* in ancient Israel, where (again esp. in wisdom literature) the pleasure of the deity was con-

---

25. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1989), 286.
26. Contra M. Mannati, *VT* 25 (1975) 659 n. 3.
27. See the discussion in R. Pautrel, *RSR* 54 (1966) 530-36.
28. See above.
29. → בחר *bāḥar.*

sidered fundamental to human existence: "If he prays to God, God will take pleasure in him [*wayyirṣēhû*]" (Job 33:26). In a similar vein we read in Prov. 16:7: "When Yahweh takes pleasure [*birṣôṯ yhwh*] in someone's ways, then Yahweh causes even that person's enemies to be reconciled peacefully."

In Ps. 147:10-11, in a late hymn, *rṣh* stands in synonymous parallelism with → חפץ *ḥāpēṣ:* Yahweh "has no delight in the speed of a man [*lō'-ḇeššôqê hā'îš yirṣeh*] . . . Yahweh takes pleasure in those who fear him [*rôṣeh yhwh 'eṯ-yerē'āyw*]." Closely allied to this sapiential mode of thought is 1 Ch. 29:17: Yahweh "takes pleasure in uprightness [*ûmêšārîm tirṣeh*]." The typical rhetoric of the book of Ecclesiastes can also use the root *rṣh:* Eccl. 9:7 justifies eating and drinking with enjoyment by arguing that everything humans do "has met with God's pleasure long before *(rāṣâ hā'elōhîm).*"

According to Ps. 149:4 (probably a very early hymn), Yahweh's pleasure in his people *(kî-rôṣeh yhwh be'ammô)* is crowned with victory. Similarly, a "historical retrospect" (Ps. 44:4[3]) recalls that in the past Yahweh gave victory to his people because he delighted in them *(kî reṣîṯām).* Thus *rṣh* also has a place in the theology of the holy war. In the people's desperate plight, a postexilic communal lament prays similarly, recalling past deliverance from affliction: "Then, O Yahweh, you were favorable to your land [*rāṣîṯā yhwh 'arṣeḵā*]" (Ps. 85:2[1]). It is clear from the context that here too there is a definite connection between *rṣh* and Yahweh's forgiveness of sin and guilt. In a similarly characteristic vein, the psalmist prays in Ps. 77:8(7): "Will the Lord spurn forever, and never again be favorable [*welō'-yōsîp lirṣôṯ 'ôd*]?" A similar notion appears in Ps. 40:14(13), in an individual lament, where deliverance[30] from deepest affliction is equated with Yahweh's favor *(reṣēh yhwh).*

In Ps. 119, a late "devotional anthology," v. 108 asks Yahweh to accept with favor the psalmist's offerings of praise *(niḏḇôṯ pî reṣēh-nā' yhwh).* But Yahweh may accept more than verbal offerings. Most of the passages where *rṣh* occurs are in cultic contexts. The words of Arauna in 2 S. 24:23 are typical. After the census of the people ordered by David, the land is devastated by Yahweh's punishment. After an altar is built on his threshing floor, the Jebusite Arauna prays: "May Yahweh your God be favorable to you [*yhwh 'elōhêḵā yirṣeḵā*]." The fate of the people depends on Yahweh's favor toward them. Such texts make clear how closely the *rṣh* of Yahweh is related to the *brk* of Yahweh. Blessing is therefore deeply embedded in the cult of ancient Israel; it is not, as is often assumed, a late development of P's cultic theology.[31]

In OT usage *rṣh* is not only a central theological term expressing fundamental relationships between God and human beings, but also a technical term of the sacrificial cult.[32] On Yahweh's favorable acceptance of the sacrifice depends the fate of Israel and those who worship Yahweh. According to P, the purpose of the cult is to settle the debt human beings owe God. In priestly thought the notion of Yahweh's "pleasure, acceptance" in the context of the sacrificial cult was developed into a comprehensive and sys-

30. → נצל *nṣl.*

31. Still valuable in detail is S. Mowinckel, *Psalmenstudien V. Segen und Fluch in Israels Kult und Psalmendichtung* (Oslo, 1924).

32. See IV below.

tematic theology of "credit": sacrifices are effectual only if they are "pleasing." Only then are they "credited." An offering that cannot be credited is an "abomination."[33]

According to Ezk. 43:26-27, an altar must be consecrated for seven days before sacrifice is offered; only then will God "be favorably inclined" (cf. 20:40-41).[34]

In critical situations it was the task of the prophets to intervene with Yahweh to inspire his pleasure in his people.[35] Sometimes, however, instead of the expected assurance of salvation the response was a prophecy of disaster: on account of the great sins of the people, "Yahweh has no pleasure in them [*yhwh lō' rāṣām*]" (Jer. 14:10; here and elsewhere NRSV translates *rṣh* with "accept"). If we can postulate a situation of "cultic" intercession here (cf. 7:16; 29:7; 37:3; 42:2), then in this passage *rṣh* appears in the context of prophetic criticism of the cult. In 14:12 Yahweh speaks through the prophet: "Although they fast, I do not hear their cry, and although they offer burnt offering and grain offering, I have no pleasure in them [*'ênennî rōṣām*]." Am. 5:22 is similar: "Even though you offer me your burnt offering . . . I have no pleasure in your grain offerings; the offerings of well-being of your fatted animals I will not look upon." On the basis of this latter text, Würthwein has contended that oracular extispicy was practiced in Israel to determine whether the sacrifice was accepted or rejected, and that it is in this concrete practice that we must seek the background for prophetic criticism of the cult.[36] Würthwein's theory is interesting but remains hypothetical.

Other prophets, too, voice their criticism of automatic "crediting of offerings": "They love sacrifices; they offer flesh and eat of it. But Yahweh has no pleasure in them [*yhwh lō' rāṣām*]" (Hos. 8:13). This criticism of the cult appears also in Mic. 6:7 and Ps. 51:18(16) (note the parallelism in the latter text with → חפץ *ḥāp̱ēṣ*).

That the prophets' criticism of the cult cannot be reduced to a simple formula is especially clear from the appearance of such criticism in Mal. 1:10,13, where the criticism of sacrifices appears in conjunction with the priestly requirement that sacrificial animals be without blemish (cf. Lev. 22). The verb *rṣh* already appears in the introduction (v. 8). The prophet ironically tells his listeners to offer the governor a lame or sick animal, then asks whether the governor will be pleased with it (*h^ayirṣ^ekā;* there is no need to emend the MT to *h^ayirṣēhû* with the LXX [*ei prosdéxetai autó*][37]). Then in v. 10 we read: *ûminḥâ lō'-'erṣeh mîyeḏkem,* "I will not accept an offering from your hand." Here again we find *rṣh* and *ḥpṣ* used in parallel. Even though the phraseology of Malachi closely resembles that of Amos, Malachi's criticism of the cult really attacks only the unfitness of the sacrificial animals. And so v. 13 goes on: "You bring what is blind and sick as an offering — should I accept that from your hand [*ha'erṣeh 'ōṯâ . . .*]?" The text is difficult.[38]

---

33. → פגול *piggûl.*

34. R. Rendtorff, *Studien zur Geschichte des Opfers im Alten Israel. WMANT* 24 (1967), 257-58.

35. For a discussion of the much-debated role of intercessor and mediator played by prophets in the religion of the OT, see S. E. Balentine, *JBL* 103 (1984) 161-73; also → פלל *pll.*

36. E. Würthwein, *TLZ* 72 (1947) 143-52.

37. B. Glazier-McDonald, *Malachi, the Divine Messenger. SBLDS* 98 (1987), 51.

38. See comms. *in loc.*

Malachi's theology clearly has more in common with the priestly tradition than with the prophets. Also typical of the late period is Hag. 1:8: the prophet's exhortation to work on the temple emphasizes that its rebuilding will give Yahweh pleasure.

Analysis of the passages in which the prophets criticize the cult thus shows clearly that the reasons behind the criticism can vary considerably. In the late prophets, this criticism bears a distinctly "priestly" stamp, whereas the criticism of the classical prophets is usually directed against syncretism, apostasy, and idolatry. Instead of sacrifice, Yahweh desires loyalty[39] and justice.[40] Sometimes — especially in the book of Jeremiah — one has the impression that sacrifices are unnecessary. The conception of the prophets recalls that of the Deuteronomists. Thus the prophetic criticism of the cult stands in the larger context of the tension between the fundamental religious conception of the prophets and Deuteronomists on the one hand and Priestly theology on the other.[41]

2. *Other Conjugations.* The verb *rṣh* occurs also in other conjugations. The occurrences of the niphal are all in Priestly texts that seek to regulate the relationship between Yahweh and those offering sacrifice; as in the corresponding texts that use the qal,[42] the verb is a technical term of sacrificial theology.[43] In Lev. 7:11-21, the Priestly regulations governing the fitness of the sacrifice of well-being,[44] v. 18 says: "If any of the flesh of the sacrifice of well-being [*mibbᵉśar-zeḇaḥ šᵉlāmāyw*] is eaten on the third day, it shall not be acceptable [*lō' yērāṣeh*]"; cf. the same prescript in 19:7).[45] The regulations governing the fitness of sacrificial animals in 22:17-25 forbid the acquisition of such animals from a foreigner: "They shall not be accepted among you [*lō' yērāṣû lāḵem*]" (v. 25). According to v. 23, a deformed or mutilated ox or sheep may be presented as a freewill offering, but "as a vow it must not be accepted [*ûlᵉnēḏer lō' yērāṣeh*]." A further regulation governing sacrificial animals in 22:26-30 provides that a newborn animal must remain with its mother for seven days (v. 27). From the eighth day on, it is "acceptable as a fire offering for Yahweh [*yērāṣeh lᵉqorban 'iššeh lᵉyhwh*]."

According to Lev. 1:4, the person offering a sacrifice is to lay his hand on the head of the burnt offering (*'ôlâ*),[46] "and it shall be acceptable for him [*wᵉnirṣâ lô*] and make atonement for him." The hypothesis that this conception of sacrifice and its acceptance is late[47] has been disputed by Milgrom;[48] with reference to 1:4, he has pointed out that

39. → חסד *ḥeseḏ.*

40. → מִשְׁפָּט *mišpāṭ.*

41. For further discussion of the prophets' criticism of the cult, see H. M. Barstad, *SVT* 34 (1984), 111-18, with bibliog.; see also IV below.

42. On *rāṣôn* see IV below.

43. See III.1 above.

44. See III.1 above.

45. D. P. Wright, *The Disposal of Impurity. SBLDS* 101 (1987), 140-43.

46. *Ibid.,* 17.

47. K. Koch, *EvT* 26 (1966) 217-38: these rites of atonement came into being during the exile, under Babylonian influence.

48. J. Milgrom, *IDBSup,* 769.

we are dealing here with a very ancient institution. Even if the present text is late, an early dating of *rṣh* in Leviticus is not ruled out. The claim that the sacrificial rites in P are to be understood solely as apotropaic exorcisms[49] is in any case an oversimplification.[50] (There is no reason to emend *nipr*ᵉ*ṣâ* in 1 Ch. 13:2 to *nirṣ*ᵉ*ṯâ*.[51])

The only instance of a piel is textually uncertain. In the second speech of Zophar (Job 20:1-29), v. 10 reads: *bānāyw y*ᵉ*raṣṣû dallîm,* "his children must seek the favor of the poor." This passage has been the subject of much discussion (cf. LXX *ollýnai*[52]). Since the MT is possible, there is no reason to question it.

The hithpael occurs once. In the story of David's dismissal from the Philistine army (1 S. 29), the Philistines ask in v. 4: "How could he [David] make himself more popular [*ûḇammeh yiṯraṣṣeh*] with his lord than with the heads of these men?"

Like the qal,[53] these other conjugations exhibit a certain semantic breadth; but they do not appear to diverge significantly from the meanings of the qal.

3. *rṣh* II. While *GesB*[13] lists only a single lexeme *rāṣâ,* a *rāṣâ* II appears for the first time in *GesB*[14]. For the most part, Hebrew philology has operated subsequently with a root *rṣh* II with the meaning "pay, receive back, satisfy, atone."[54] The qal is identified in Lev. 26:41; 26:43; 2 Ch. 36:21, the niphal in Isa. 40:2, and the hiphil in Lev. 26:34. Many, however, have not accepted a *rṣh* II.[55] The decomposition of *rṣh* into two different lexemes is in fact hardly sustainable. The basic problem is the extremely rich semantic field of *rṣh* (note the variety of translations used by LXX[56]). Furthermore, the claimed instances of *rṣh* II are not uniform. The famous text Isa. 40:2, *kî nirṣâ ʿ*ᵃ*wōnâ,* is usually translated with "paid, settled, forgiven," or the like. But this translation does not necessarily presuppose the existence of a *rṣh* II. The niphal of *rṣh* is easily understood here as a variant on the standard terminology of sacrifice, in the sense "her sin has been accepted," i.e., has been forgiven by God. The best translation of *rṣh* here is "expiated." Such a meaning of the lexeme appears also in postbiblical texts[57] and in Modern Hebrew. The meaning "expiate" can be understood easily as a later development, so that the hypothesis of a *rṣh* II is unnecessary.

That *rṣh* can have this meaning is also shown by Lev. 26:34: "Then [after the catastrophe] the land shall accept [*tirṣeh;* EÜ 'make up for'; NRSV 'enjoy'] its sabbath years as long as it lies desolate, while you are in the land of your enemies. Then the land rests and has its sabbaths accepted [*w*ᵉ*hirṣāṯ;* EÜ 'receive compensation for'; NRSV 'enjoy']." The tone here is bitterly ironic. The verse probably means that the

---

49. E.g., J. G. Vink, *OTS* 15 (1969), esp. 140.
50. Milgrom, *IDBSup,* 78-82.
51. *BHK* and *HAL,* following LXX *(eudṓthē).*
52. See VII below.
53. See III.1 above.
54. *GesB; HAL;* E. Ben Yehuda, *Thesaurus totius hebraitatis.*
55. E.g., König, 452; *LexHebAram,* 786; Gerleman, 810.
56. See VII below.
57. For the Dead Sea Scrolls see VI below.

land must accept involuntary sabbath years on account of the many sabbath years incurred as a debt during the period before the exile — or, more simply: since the people's failure to observe the sabbaths of Yahweh led to devastation (Ezk. 20:13; Neh. 13:17-18), now the land must accept a sabbath rest involuntarily (see also v. 35). Stylistically, we are still dealing here with a kind of wordplay, an ironic variant on the Priestly "credit terminology."

The same notion appears again in Lev. 26:43: "The land accepts [*weṯireṣ*] when it lies desolated without its inhabitants." Then, however, the verse goes on: "They shall expiate their iniquity [*yirṣû 'eṯ-'ᵃwōnām*]." In the same context (v. 41) we read: "Then their uncircumcised heart must be humbled, and then they must expiate their sins [*we'āz yirṣû 'eṯ-'ᵃwōnām*]." Bertholet rightly says: "The author appears to enjoy playing on words."[58] Lev. 26:41 and 43 use the same language as the prologue of Deutero-Isaiah[59] (*rṣh* + → עון *'āwôn*[60]). The language of v. 43a reappears in 2 Ch. 36:21: "to fulfill the word of Yahweh by the mouth of Jeremiah, until the land had accepted [*'aḏ-rāṣeṯâ*] its sabbaths." Both passages are very late. The theological focus of these texts is on the need for the people to expiate their sin if Yahweh is to remember his covenant with their ancestors.

Apart from Isa. 40:2 and Lev. 26:41, the instances of a possible *rṣh* II all involve a kind of technical term in conjunction with the sabbath. Here too the formula *rṣh* + *'āwōn* usually appears in the immediate context. Bertholet and Gerleman have noted correctly that the lexeme *rṣh* is used almost as a play on words.[61] The texts — all very late — are exegetically problematic, but the best translation is "accept." Thus there is no real reason to postulate the existence of *rṣh* II.

IV. Noun. The noun *rāṣôn* occurs 56 times in the OT. Its semantic range approximates (and in part coincides with) that of the verb *rṣh;* it can best be translated as "pleasure, goodwill, favor, goodness, love, understanding," or "will, wish, desire," etc. As a cultic term it occurs in the expression *lerāṣôn,* with the meaning "acceptance" (of a sacrifice). Semantically, the lexeme *rāṣôn* is very close to → חפץ *ḥāpēṣ/ḥēpeṣ*. Other synonyms include → אהב *'ahᵃḇâ;* → אמן *'emûnâ, 'emeṯ;* → אשרי *'ašrê;* → ברית *berîṯ;* → ברך *berāḵâ;* → חנן *ḥēn, ḥannûn;* → חסד *ḥeseḏ;*[62] → טוב *ṭôḇâ, ṭôḇ be'ênê;* → ישע *yešû'â;* → ישר *yāšar be'ênê;* → כבוד *kāḇôḏ; nîḥōaḥ;*[63] → נעם *nā'am, nā'îm, nō'am;* → ערב *'ārēḇ;* → רחם *rḥm, raḥûm;* → שלום *šālôm;* as well as other idiomatic constructions with *'im* and *'eṯ.*[64]

The noun is also used concretely in an objectified sense: "that which is pleasant, etc." Sometimes it is semantically impossible to distinguish the derived noun *rāṣôn*

---

58. A. Bertholet, *Leviticus. KHC* III (1901), 96.
59. See above.
60. See also R. Knierim, *Die Hauptbegriffe für Sünde im AT* (Gütersloh, 1965), 259-61.
61. Gerleman, 811.
62. E. Kellenberger, *Häsäd wä'ᵃmät als Ausdruck einer Glaubensenfahrung. ATANT* 69 (1982).
63. But see *HAL,* I, 696.
64. D. Vetter, *Jahwes Mit-Sein als Ausdruck des Segens. AzT* I/45 (1971).

from forms of the verb *rṣh*. Like *rṣh, rāṣôn* is relatively frequent in the Psalms, always with God as the subject (act. or pass.); but these occurrences exhibit great variety. Most, if datable at all, are late. In Ps. 19, for example, a postexilic hymn in praise of the *tôrâ*, v. 15(14) prays that the psalmist's words of praise will be pleasing *(yihyû lᵉrāṣôn)* to Yahweh. In Ps. 5, an individual lament, the psalmist prays in v. 13(12) that Yahweh will cover the righteous with his favor (*rāṣôn*, here in a double acc. construction) as with a shield. In Ps. 69:14(13), probably a postexilic lament, the psalmist prays to Yahweh "in an acceptable time" *('ēṯ rāṣôn)*.[65] In a hymn praising Yahweh's power as creator (89:18[17]; the hymn is probably much earlier than the postexilic lament over the rejection of the house of David in which it is embedded[66]), the psalmist says: "For you are their glory and strength, you exalt [*K*] our might by your favor [*ûḇirṣōnᵉḵā tārîm qarnēnû*]." In 106:4, in an exhortation to give thanks and praise used to introduce a postexilic historical psalm, the psalmist says: "Remember me, Yahweh, out of love [*birṣôn*] for your people" (cf. the use of *rṣh* in 44:4[3]; 149:4[67]). In this way, *rāṣôn* finds natural use in the context of Israel's election.

According to 30:6(5), Yahweh is only a moment in his anger, but lifelong in his favor (*birṣônô;* cf. v. 8[7]; text?). According to 145:16, Yahweh opens his hand and fills everything that lives as is his pleasure *(rāṣôn)*. In Isa. 60:10, too, *rāṣôn* stands for Yahweh's favor toward his people. In this description of the future glory of Zion and the rebuilding of Jerusalem, Yahweh proclaims that, although he struck down his people in his wrath, he will now have mercy *(riḥam)* on them in his favor *(ûḇirṣônî)*. Isa. 49:8 speaks of the "time of favor" *('ēṯ rāṣôn)*.[68] This expression refers to the "time of grace and mercy" after the catastrophe, when Yahweh will come to the aid of his people once more. In an oracle of salvation whose phraseology recalls Deutero-Isaiah, 61:2 speaks of a "year of Yahweh's favor."[69] Here *šᵉnaṯ rāṣôn lᵉyhwh* parallels *yôm nāqām lē'lōhênû*, "the day of vengeance for our God." The passage links Yahweh's gracious favor with the ancient concept of the "day of Yahweh"[70] (cf. also 34:8; 63:4; Jer. 46:10). Thus Isa. 61:2 also connects the salvation of God's people with the downfall of Israel's enemies.[71]

In the book of Leviticus, the expression *lᵉrāṣôn* serves as a technical term denoting God's favorable acceptance of the sacrificial offerings (alternating with *rṣh*[72]). It appears in Lev. 1:3 in the regulations governing the burnt offering *('ôlâ):* a male animal without blemish is to be sacrificed at the entrance to the tent of meeting, that it (the sacrifice) may find acceptance before Yahweh *(lirṣônô lip̄nê yhwh)*.[73]

---

65. For further discussion of this expression see below.
66. T. Veijola, *Verheissung in der Krise. AnAcScFen* B/220 (1982), 45-46.
67. See III above.
68. See Ps. 69:14(13) cited above.
69. W. Zimmerli, *Archäologie und AT. FS K. Galling* (Tübingen, 1970), 321-32.
70. → יום *yôm*.
71. Contra C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1969), 365-67.
72. See III above.
73. See III above.

The individual precepts governing sacrificial animals in Lev. 19 also deal with the fitness of the sacrificial offerings. Here *rāṣôn* functions as a technical term of Priestly "credit/merit theology." Vv. 5-8, which discuss the proper way to eat the sacrifice, contain the precept: "When you offer a *zeḇaḥ šᵉlāmîm* for Yahweh, offer it in such a way that it is acceptable in your behalf [*lirṣōnᵉḵem*]" (v. 5). The requirement that sacrificial animals be without blemish is the primary subject of 22:17-25. According to vv. 19ff., the sacrifice is to be "acceptable in your behalf [*lirṣōnᵉḵem*]." These texts make clear that fitness of the sacrificial animal is an absolute condition for acceptance of a sacrifice (on this notion see also Dt. 15:21; 17:1).

According to Lev. 22:29, a thanksgiving offering *(zeḇaḥ-tôḏâ)* is to be such that it may be "acceptable on your behalf [*lirṣōnᵉḵem*]" (cf. also 23:11). In Ex. 28:36-38, finally, the Aaronic diadem[74] is to have a golden rosette and a blue cord: "It shall always be on his forehead, in order that they [the congregation] may find favor [*lᵉrāṣôn lāhem*] before Yahweh."

The noun *rāṣôn* (with or without *lᵉ*) occurs 6 times in the book of Isaiah (49:8; 56:7; 58:5; 60:7,10; 61:2). These texts all deal with Yahweh's *rāṣôn,* but they are not homogeneous. Two utterances having to do with eschatological salvation recall the use of *rṣh* in Ezk. 20:40-41.[75] The Isaiah texts, however, do not speak of Yahweh's own people but of the eschatological future of the foreigners (Isa. 56:7): "Their burnt offerings and their sacrifices will be accepted [*lᵉrāṣôn*] on my altar, for my house shall be a house of prayer for all people."[76] In the context of the nations' pilgrimage to Jerusalem (60:1-7), v. 7 is probably to be understood in the same sense (MT is corrupt: read *lᵉrāṣôn ʿal-mizbᵉḥî* with 56:7). Isa. 58:5 (cf. the texts using *rṣh* in criticism of the cult) attacks fasting that is not appropriate to a *yôm rāṣôn lᵉyhwh.*

In Jer. 6:20, too, *lᵉrāṣôn* appears in an oracle criticizing the cult of Yahweh's own people: "Your burnt offerings are not acceptable [*lᵉrāṣôn*], nor are your sacrifices pleasing to me [*lōʾ-ʿarᵉḇû lî*]." Here the use of *rāṣôn* is identical with that of *rṣh* in Jer. 14:12; Hos. 8:13; Am. 5:22; Mic. 6:7.[77]

The Psalms use *rāṣôn* similarly to criticize the cult. Ps. 51:20(18) is particularly interesting. In a postexilic addition (vv. 20-21 [18-19]) to an earlier individual lament and petition (Ps. 51), the redactor has reacted to vv. 18-19(16-17), which strongly criticize the cult, and attenuated the criticism: when Yahweh in his good pleasure *(ḇirṣônᵉḵā)* rebuilds the walls of Jerusalem, then he will delight *(taḥpōṣ)* again in the sacrifices. This passage illustrates the semantic proximity of *rṣh* and *ḥpṣ*.

In several texts *rāṣôn* has the meaning "wish, desire, will, purpose." An example is Ps. 40:9(8) (postexilic): "I delight [*ḥāp̄āṣtî*], O my God, to do your will [*laʿᵃśôṯ-rᵉṣônᵉḵā*]." Since, however, the context is critical of sacrifice (cf. v. 7[6]), the statement in v. 9 must be classed with other texts that use both *rāṣôn* and *rṣh* in criticizing the

74. K. Galling, *BRL²*, 257.
75. See III above.
76. M. A. Beek, *De Knecht. FS J. L. Koole* (Kampen, 1978), 17-22.
77. See III above.

cult.[78] Ps. 103:21 calls on "those who do his will [*r^eṣônô*]" to praise Yahweh. In Ps. 143:10 the psalmist prays: "Teach me to do your will [*r^eṣôneḵā*], for you are my God." Ezra's demand that mixed marriages be dissolved (Ezr. 10:11) is identical with the demand "to do his will" *(wa^{ʿa}śû r^eṣônô)*.

Several texts that have to do with interpersonal relationships use *rāṣôn* with the meaning "choice, liking." According to the historical retrospect in the penitential liturgy of the Levites (Neh. 9:24), after the conquest of the promised land, the Israelites could do with the Canaanites whatever they liked *(la^{ʿa}śôṯ bāhem kirṣônām)*. The idiom *ʿāśâ kirṣônô* can signify the arbitrary conduct of the king, who acts "as he pleases" (Dnl. 11:3,16,36; cf. also 8:4). The guests invited to a banquet in the royal palace are to do as they desire (Est. 1:8). According to Est. 9:5, the Jews did as they pleased *(kirṣônām)* to those who hated them.

In the Psalms, too, we find the lexeme *rāṣôn* used in this sense. According to Ps. 145:19, Yahweh "fulfills the desire of those who fear him [*r^eṣôn-y^erēʾāyw*], he hears their cry and saves them."

Like *rṣh, rāṣôn* also appears in wisdom literature. Of the 14 occurrences in Proverbs, 3 are in passages that refer to the king. A servant who deals wisely enjoys the king's favor (*r^eṣôn meleḵ*, 14:35), which is like the clouds that bring the spring rain (16:15) or dew on the grass (19:12). Righteous lips are the delight of kings (*r^eṣôn m^elāḵîm*, 16:13); the lips of the righteous know what is acceptable (*yēḏ^eʿûn rāṣôn*, 10:32). The MT of 14:9 has been the subject of much discussion, but can probably be left as it stands;[79] the verse has to do with mutual goodwill among the upright. A similar notion appears in 11:27: "the one who diligently seeks good seeks satisfaction [*y^eḇaqqēš rāṣôn*]."

Elsewhere in Proverbs, *rāṣôn* is associated with Yahweh as inner subject. The relationship between man and wife meets with Yahweh's *rāṣôn* (18:22). Wisdom says: "Whoever finds me finds life and obtains favor [*rāṣôn*] from Yahweh" (8:35). An accurate weight is Yahweh's *rāṣôn* (11:1), as are blameless ways (11:20), truth (10:32), goodness (12:2,22), and righteous lips (16:13).

Prov. 15:8 is a sapiential variant of the criticism of the cult found elsewhere in the OT: "The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to Yahweh, but the prayer of the upright is his delight [*ûṯ^epillaṯ y^ešārîm r^eṣônô*].[80]

Finally, *rāṣôn* appears in Dt. 33: Moses' blessing for Joseph (vv. 13-17) prays that the favor of the one who dwells in the briar bush *(r^eṣôn šōḵ^enî s^eneh)* may come on the head of Joseph (v. 16), and the blessing for Naphtali prays that Naphtali may be sated with favor *(ś^eḇaʿ rāṣôn)* and full of the blessing of Yahweh (v. 23).

V. Names. The masc. name *riṣyāʾ* in 1 Ch. 7:39 derives from *rṣh*, as does the fem. name *tirṣâ*, the name of one of the five daughters of Zelophehad (Nu. 26:33; 27:1;

78. See III above.

79. The discussion is summarized by W. McKane, *Proverbs. OTL* (1970), 475-76.

80. See above.

36:11; Josh. 17:3). These names (which mean "pleasant, agreeable") belong to the class of personal names that emphasize psychological traits.[81] The name *rᵉṣîn* (2 K. 15:37; 16:5,6,9; Isa. 7:1,4,8; 8:6; 9:10[11]; Ezr. 2:48; Neh. 7:50) may also derive from *rṣh*.[82] As a toponym, the form *tirṣâ* is also the name of a Canaanite city (Josh. 12:24) that later became a residence of the Israelite kings (1 K. 14:17; 15:21,33; 16:6,8-9,15,17,23; 2 K. 15:14,16); the city clearly enjoyed an especially lovely situation,[83] alluded to in Cant. 6:4, where the lover says to his bride, "You are beautiful as Tirzah, my love, comely as Jerusalem."

VI. Dead Sea Scrolls. The verb *rāṣâ* occurs 27 times in the Dead Sea Scrolls, the noun *rāṣôn* 76 times. Their usage scarcely diverges from that found in the OT, but the texts are of great value both theologically and linguistically.

The verb occurs most often in the Manual of Discipline. In 1QS 3:11 (cf. 8:10) the devout "will be pleasing" *(yrṣh)* through atonement. According to 4:1, Yahweh takes pleasure *(yrṣh)* in the deeds of the spirit of light. The teacher of the community *(hmśkyl)* takes pleasure in all that he does (9:24); here, as often in the OT, *rṣh* parallels *ḥpṣ*. The teacher also delights in God's judgments (*w'rṣh k'šr yšwpṭny*, 10:13), "and will not be appeased [*wlw' 'rṣh*] until his judgment is established" (10:20). God's delight in the elect of humanity is mentioned in 11:16. The author of the Hymns accepts *(rṣh)* his affliction because he hopes for God's mercy (1QH 9:10). The wicked do not delight *(wl' rṣw)* in God's commandments (15:18). The Damascus Document appeals to the community "to choose that in which he [God] takes pleasure [*'t 'šr rṣh*] and to reject that which he hates" (2:15). As is true of many fragmentary texts, the interpretation of 1QpHab 7:16 is uncertain. In combination with *'āwōn, rṣh* has the meaning "expiate."[84] According to 1QS 8:3, one of the tasks of the twelve men belonging to the community council is to expiate sin. This is also the meaning of *rṣh* in 4QDibHam[a] frs. 1-2, 6:5.

The noun *rṣwn* also appears frequently in 1QH. Without Yahweh's "will," nothing is known (1:8; the reading of ll. 10 and 15 is uncertain). According to 4:33, human beings are "sons of his [God's] pleasure [*rṣwnw*]." But at the same time we read: "According to your will [*'l py rṣwnkh*] and in your h[a]nd is judgment upon them all" (5:4). God's compassion is for all the "sons of his pleasure" (11:9). Of great theological interest is 15:15, which states that the righteous are predestined by God for the time of favor[85] from the womb. Here predestination is thematized, although it is by no means accepted exclusively. For example, the worshiper who is confident of being elect must nevertheless cleanse his hands in accordance with God's will (*krṣw[nk]*). In 16:12 the worshiper cleanses himself in order to bring himself near to God's pleasure *(wlhgyšny brṣwnk)*. In the fragments of 1QH, *rṣwn* occurs four times. Of particular in-

81. *IPN*, 228-29.
82. Contra *IPN*, 224.
83. On its identification see H. Weippert, *BRL*³, 344-45.
84. See III.3 above.
85. See IV above.

terest is the expression *'d qṣ rṣwnkh,* "until the (set) time of your [God's] favor" (1QH fr. 9:8).

God has given command "according to his will" (*rṣwnw,* 1QS 5:1); it is good to search it out (5:9) and govern one's conduct by it (5:10). Perfect conduct is "like a pleasing freewill offering" (*kndbt mnḥt rṣwn,* 9:5; cf. also CD 11:21). The *maśkîl* regulations in 1QS 9 stipulate that the *maśkîl* is to "do everything according to the will of God" (*l'śwt 't rṣwn 'l,* 9:13ff.; cf. 9:23-24).

The noun *rṣwn* occurs 7 times in the Damascus Document, where the usage of the lexeme differs from that in the other texts, since it appears also with human subjects. The ancestors were punished because "they acted according to their own will" (*b'śwtm 't rṣwnm,* CD 2:21; cf. 3:11-12). Abraham is extolled because he kept God's commandments "and did not choose the will of his own spirit" (*wl' bḥr brṣwn rwḥw,* 3:3).

VII. LXX. The LXX uses a variety of translations for *rāṣâ* and *rāṣôn.* For the verb we find *eudokeín* (22 times), *prosdéchesthai* (13 times), *déchesthai* (6 times), *dektós* (3 times), *eulogeín* (3 times), and *agapán, dektós eínai, diallássein, eisakoúein, episkopḗ, euodoún, thélein, ethélein, lýein, ollýnai, paradéchesthai,* and *syntréchein* (once each).

The noun *rāṣôn* is translated by *dektós* (21 times), *thélēma* (9 times), *eudokía* (7 times), *arestós* (3 times), *cháris* (3 times), *prosdektós* (twice), *thélēsis* (twice), and *boúlesthai, éleos, epithymía, thélein, ethélein, hilarós,* and *hilarótēs* (once each).

Barstad

רָצַח *rāṣaḥ*

I. Etymology. II. Occurrences. III. Lexical Field. IV. Synchronic Plane. V. Categories. VI. Diachronic Analysis: 1. Early Texts; 2. Apodictic Laws and Prophetic Invective; 3. Asylum. VII. Summary. VIII. LXX; Dead Sea Scrolls.

---

rāṣaḥ. A. G. Auld, "Cities of Refuge in Israelite Tradition," *JSOT* 10 (1978) 26-40; H. J. Boecker, *Recht und Gesetz im AT und im Alten Orient* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, [2]1984), esp. 28-29; H. Christ, *Blutvergiessen im AT. Theologische Dissertationen* 12 (Basel, 1977); P. C. Craigie, *The Problem of War in the OT* (Grand Rapids, 1978), esp. 55-63; F. Crüsemann, *Bewahrung der Freiheit* (Gütersloh, 1983); A. Deissler, *"Ich bin dein Gott, der dich befreit hat"* (1975); P. Haas, "Die he shall surely die," *Semeia* 45 (1989) 67-87; F.-L. Hossfeld, *Der Dekalog. OBO* 45 (1982); A. Jepsen, "Du sollst nicht töten!" *Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung* 13 (1959) 384-85; B. Janowski, "Auslösung des verwirkten Lebens," *ZTK* 79 (1982) 25-59; S. E. Loewenstamm, "The Laws of Adultery and Murder in Biblical and Mesopotamian Law," *Comparative Studies in Biblical and Ancient Oriental Literatures. AOAT* 204 (1980), 146-53; B. Mazar, "The Cities of the Priests and the Levites," *SVT* 7 (1960), 193-205; N. M. Nicolsky, "Das Asylrecht in Israel," *ZAW* 48 (1930) 146-75; A. Phillips, *Ancient Israel's Criminal Law* (Oxford, 1970), esp. 82-109; H. Graf Reventlow, *Gebot und Predigt im Dekalog* (Gütersloh, 1962), esp. 71-77; H. Schüngel-Straumann, *Der Dekalog — Gottes Gebote? SBS* 67 (1973), esp. 39-47; H. Schulz, *Das*

I. Etymology. There are few cognates of *rāṣaḥ* in other languages. Only in North Arabic do we find a verb *raḍaḥa,* which means "break to pieces, shatter";[1] OSA *rḍḥ,* "strike, fight," may also be related.[2] The absence of cognate roots in the law codes of the ancient Near East appears to suggest that *rṣḥ* is not a legal term but belongs to everyday language.

II. Occurrences. There are 46 occurrences of forms derived from *rṣḥ* in the OT (47 if we include MT *trṣḥw* in Ps. 62:4[Eng. 3], which appears to be corrupt[3]). The bulk of these occurrences are in the laws governing asylum in Dt. 4:41-43; 19:1-13; Nu. 35; Josh. 20–21, and (in the Decalogue) Ex. 20:13; Dt. 5:17. The unique occurrence in Dt. 22:26 stands apart: this text is the only legal ordinance in which *rṣḥ* occurs outside the laws governing asylum and the Decalogue. The other occurrences are in narrative texts in the historical books: Jgs. 20:4; 1 K. 21:19; 2 K. 6:32; in the Prophets: Isa. 1:21; Jer. 7:9; Hos. 4:2; 6:9; in the Psalms: 62:4(3); 94:6; and in wisdom: Job 24:14; Prov. 22:13.

III. Lexical Field. "Lexical field" is used here in accordance with Kedar's definition: "a group of words similar in meaning." "The neighboring terms are mutually interactive, so that they are interdependent . . . with respect to semantic compass, usage, and distribution."[4] By analyzing semantically related words belonging to the lexical field "kill," we shall attempt to encircle the meaning of the root *rṣḥ.* Our primary interest will be in synonyms that occur in the Hebrew text in combination with *rṣḥ.*

Three verbs in particular appear in the context of *rṣḥ:* → מות *mûṯ* hiphil (cf. Nu. 35:19,21 with 35:27,30), הרג *hārag* (Ps. 94:6), and the Aramaic loanword *qṭl* (Job 24:14). All three mean "kill" in the broadest sense and do not convey additional details about the manner of killing. In Nu. 35:19,21, the hiphil of *mwt* denotes the killing of a murderer by the hand of the authorized avenger of blood; *rṣḥ* denotes the same act in vv. 27,30. In these texts, therefore, *mwt* and *rṣḥ* are strictly synonymous. The instructions in these verses are meant to assure that the execution is carried out, not to determine how it is done. In Ps. 94:6 *rṣḥ* is yoked in synonymous parallelism with *hrg.* The latter denotes the killing of human beings by other persons, divine or human, likewise without reference to how they are put to death. In Job 24:14 *rṣḥ* appears in synthetic parallelism with *qṭl,* which means "kill" in the broadest sense. Here too all that matters is the outcome of the act. Nothing is said about how the killing is done.

In addition, *mwt, hrg,* and *qṭl* are unrestricted with respect to the subject and object

---

Todesrecht im AT. BZAW 114 (1969), esp. 9-15; J. J. Stamm, "Sprachliche Erwägungen zum Gebot 'Du sollst nicht töten,'" *TZ* 1 (1945) 81-90.

→ מקלט *miqlāṭ.*

1. Lane, I/3, 1096; Wehr, 343.

2. Biella, 493-94.

3. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1989), 12, prefers the emendation *trwṣw.*

4. B. Kedar, *Biblische Semantik* (Stuttgart, 1981), 181.

of the act of killing. Even God can be the subject (Ex. 13:15; Isa. 27:1; Am. 4:10; 9:1; Ps. 78:34; 135:10; 139:19; Job 13:15; Lam. 2:21; 3:43). Often *rṣḥ* is glossed by *nkh* (hiphil) *nep̱eš* (Josh. 20:3; Nu. 35:11) or *rʿ* (Dt. 19:4). If we compare Dt. 22:26 and 4:42 with 19:11 and 19:4, we note that the first two texts use *rṣḥ* strictly synonymously with *nkh* hiphil, which denotes the outward act of striking, which may or may not result in death. Its range of meanings thus extends from "strike" to "slay," and it emphasizes the use of physical force.[5]

Finally, the formula *šāp̱aḵ dām (nāqî),* "shed (innocent) blood," occurs also in the context of *rṣḥ*. In Dt. 19:10 this expression denotes the killing of a fellow Israelite "out of hatred." In Jer. 7:6,9, first *šāp̱aḵ dām nāqî* and then *rṣḥ* appears in the infinitive absolute in catalogs of vices. The structures of these catalogs are not strictly parallel, but it does appear that the actions denoted in v. 6 by *šāp̱aḵ dām nāqî* are the same referred to by *rṣḥ* in v. 9. In Nu. 35:33, finally, this expression summarizes the preceding specific provisions concerning homicides in the general principle that no expiation can be made for blood that is shed (*špk* pual) in the promised land except by the blood of the one who shed *(špk)* it. The association of this statement with the preceding provisions governing asylum (vv. 22-29) shows clearly that here *šāp̱aḵ dām* denotes the intentional violent killing of a fellow human being, homicides characterized in the preceding verses by the adverbial qualifiers *beśin'â,* "out of hatred," *biṣḏîyâ,* "from ambush," and *beʾêḇâ,* "out of enmity" (vv. 20-21). The perpetrator is termed *rōṣēaḥ* (v. 21). In the context of Nu. 35, then, *šāp̱aḵ dām* and *rṣḥ* (used absolutely) denote killing by force; the expression *šāp̱aḵ dām* emphasizes the guilt incurred by the action and sets it solemnly within the compass of religious ideology (the purity of the land where Yahweh dwells in the midst of his people).

These synonyms have helped define the meaning of *rṣḥ* as culpable killing by use of force. The nature of the act is left fully undefined. Negatively, it is noteworthy that *rṣḥ* is never used for killing in battle or for killing in self-defense.[6] Neither is it used for suicide. The frequent claim that it is also not employed for execution of the death penalty, however, is contradicted by Nu. 35:30, where the root denotes the execution of a murderer by the duly authorized avenger of blood (reading vv. 27 and 30 in conjunction with v. 24).

IV. Synchronic Plane. The root *rṣḥ* is used in so many ways in its biblical occurrences that it is difficult to define its meaning. If we attempt here to examine the occurrences of the word in their syntactic contexts on a single "synchronic plane," we do so fully aware that this examination involves a foreshortened perspective that is methodologically determined. We must also remember that the corpus of biblical writings is not a closed system but an open system. The tokens employed and the whole that they constitute are not defined once and for all, but are partially dependent on the flow — now dried up — of everyday discourse. Naive utterances employing *rṣḥ* (narrative

5. Schüngel-Straumann, 55-79; Christ, 15.
6. Jepsen, 385; Christ, 12-16, 61-62.

texts) appear side by side with attempts to be linguistically definitive (laws governing asylum).

Only Israelites appear as subjects of *rṣḥ* — more specifically those addressed by the Decalogue (i.e., adult male Israelites who are full citizens)[7] and the Dtn law code, the Israelites "in the land that Yahweh, the God of your ancestors, has given you to occupy" (Dt. 12:1): King Ahab (1 K. 21; 2 K. 6:32), Israelites along with resident or transient aliens (Nu. 35:15), a group of priests (Hos. 6:9), men of Gibeah (Jgs. 19–20). Only in Prov. 22:13 does an animal appear as the semantic subject of the verb. Here the verb is used metaphorically: the lion whose attack the lazy person fears symbolizes some power that appears to threaten mortal danger. The use in this passage of the word *rṣḥ,* normally found in contexts involving human beings, brands the lazy person's language as figurative while simultaneously characterizing it as a grotesque delusion.

As objects of *rṣḥ* we find: a "neighbor"[8] (Dt. 19:5), an Israelite citizen (Naboth, 1 K. 21), an engaged woman (Dt. 22:26), the concubine of a Levite (Jgs. 20:4). The verb is often used absolutely, especially in the Decalogue (Ex. 20:13; Dt. 5:17) and the Prophets (Isa. 1:21; Jer. 7:9; Hos. 4:2; 6:9), as well as the pregnant passage 1 K. 21:19. An animal is never the object of *rṣḥ.* For the killing of animals ("slaughtering"), the verb *šḥṭ* or *ṭbḥ* is used.

These observations show that the basic meaning of *rṣḥ* is the killing of human beings within the community of Israel. Stamm emphasizes the "antisocial" nature of this killing;[9] Deissler says that *rṣḥ* has overtones of the "private sphere" in which the killing in question takes place, thus distinguishing it from lawful execution and killing in battle, which are allowed or even required.[10]

Deuteronomy requires the destruction *(ḥērem)*[11] of enemy peoples that are conquered in a holy war to win the vital land (Dt. 7:2; 20:17; cf. Josh. 8:26; 1 S. 15:3). The verbs used for "kill" in this context are *nkh* hiphil and *ḥrm.*

Finally, Crüsemann points out that even in cases when it is "utterly impossible or unlikely that the guilty *rōṣēaḥ* caused the death directly and personally,"[12] the use of force to kill others can be denoted by *rṣḥ.* The instances he has in mind are Ahab's judicial murder of Naboth (1 K. 21), the killing of orphans (Ps. 94:6) or the poor and needy (Job 24:14), and the rape of an engaged woman (Dt. 22:26).

Two kinds of killing in the private human sphere are conceivable: (a) intentional killing "out of hatred" (*beśin'â,* Nu. 35:20), "from ambush" (*biṣḏîyâ,* Nu. 35:20), or "out of enmity" (*be'ēḇâ,* Nu. 35:21) — i.e., murder; and (b) "unintentional" (*biḇlî-ḏa'aṯ,* Dt. 4:42) or "unpremeditated" (*bišgāgâ,* Nu. 35:11) killing — i.e., what we call manslaughter. These two kinds of killing cannot possibly be predicated of Yahweh, and in fact Yahweh is never the subject of this verb.

---

7. Crüsemann, 28-29.
8. → רע *rēa'.*
9. Stamm, 88.
10. Deissler, 102.
11. → חרם *ḥrm* II.
12. Crüsemann, 68.

In summary, *rṣḥ* can be defined as a crime against life and limb of another Israelite. Because the root already includes the notion of a victim (a fellow Israelite, a resident or transient alien [Nu. 35:15], or a Levite's concubine [Jgs. 20:4ff.]), the verb can also be used absolutely. Like *nā'ap̱,* "commit adultery," it appears commonly as an absolute participle.[13]

V. Categories. The verb appears 40 times in the qal, twice in the niphal, and 5 times in the piel. There is no good reason to treat these stems differently, with the semantic distinction that the qal means "kill" while the piel means "murder." With Jenni, it is better to distinguish between the qal as referring to a single action and the piel as referring to a repeated, habitual action.[14] This aspectual difference also better explains the shift from piel to qal in related passages. For example, Hos. 4:2 (qal) is related to Hos. 6:9 (piel), and 2 K. 6:32 (piel) is related to 1 K. 21:19 (qal). It is preferable, therefore, to categorize the texts using *rṣḥ* into three groups according to their subject matter.

First, asylum. We find *rṣḥ* in Nu. 35, Dt. 4, Dt. 19, and Josh. 20–21 in the context of cities of refuge. This is the largest group, with 33 occurrences. Here the meaning is generally subject to the constraints of legal usage: *rṣḥ* is defined as accidental homicide and a *rōṣēaḥ* is a person who commits manslaughter. Only in Nu. 35 is the root understood as denoting sometimes manslaughter, sometimes murder. In Dt. 4:42 the verb is expanded by the addition of the obj. *rēaʿ.* The context (vv. 41-43) speaks of setting apart three cities of refuge and quotes from the detailed regulations of Dt. 19:2-7. Against this background, it is striking that, as in 19:4, the case of a *rōṣēaḥ* seeking asylum is defined more precisely by means of relative clauses. But the definition tautologically uses the verb *rṣḥ* — a sign that within the asylum laws the meaning of the technical term "manslaughter" is beginning to grow fuzzy. Possibly Dt. 4:41-43 also has in mind the Decalogue of Dt. 5, where *rṣḥ* denotes intentional and reprehensible killing, so that the unintentional nature of the killing in 4:42 must be highlighted. To this extent 4:41-43 presupposes both 19:2-7,11-13 and also Dt. 5 with the Decalogue.

Second, apodictic laws and prophetic invective. Under this heading, we call attention first to the triads in Hos. 4:2 (murder — stealing — adultery) and Jer. 7:9 (stealing — murder — adultery), the two versions of the Decalogue with their triads (Ex. 20:13-15 and Dt. 5:17-19), and finally Isa. 1:21-23 and Job 24:14. This group is characterized by the absolute use of the verb, whether as a prohibitive without an object, an infinitive absolute, or a participle. Here the verb clearly denotes the intentional and hence morally reprehensible killing of a fellow Israelite.

Third, other. The seven remaining occurrences are distributed among a threat of punishment for whoever rapes a young woman in open country (Dt. 22:26), the account of the rape of a Levite's resulting in her death (Jgs. 20:4), Ahab's judicial murders of Naboth (1 K. 21:19; 2 K. 6:32), Hosea's attack on the actions of a group of priests on the road to Shechem (Hos. 6:9), a description of the actions of the wicked

13. W. Richter, *Recht und Ethos. SANT* 15 (1966), 128 n. 23.
14. *HP,* 161-62.

(Ps. 94:6), and a proverb concerning the delusions of the lazy (Prov. 22:13). In this group, too, *rṣḥ* denotes the violent killing of persons in Israel; the cases involved fill the word with recollections of particularly heinous deeds.

VI. Diachronic Analysis. The simultaneous presence of the mutually exclusive meanings "intentional killing" and "unintentional killing" in the groups just described raises the question of how they are related. Here we shall use the methods of redaction criticism to cast light on the problem.

1. *Early Texts.* The texts in the third group described above go back in part to the premonarchic period. The incident of the rape of a Levite's concubine leading to her death (Jgs. 20:4) became notorious as the outrage of Gibeah (Hos. 9:9; 10:9). The description of the crime in Jgs. 20:4-5 shares many key words with the case of the rape of an engaged woman in Dt. 22:22-27. It is quite possible that the Dtn codifiers were thinking of the outrage of Gibeah when they stated the earlier reason for declaring the woman exempt from punishment (v. 26b). In both cases the finding of *rṣḥ* describes a particularly heinous offense against a weak and helpless victim.

The judicial murder of Naboth (1 K. 21:19) is probably another famous incident in northern Israel deserving the finding of *rṣḥ*. The perpetrator did not cause the victim's death by using his own physical strength but engineered it through accomplices. In 2 K. 6:32 Elisha alludes to the Naboth incident. The Dtr redactors have shifted the Elisha stories of 2 K. 6:8–7:20 to the reign of Joram and painted the prophets Elijah and Elisha as engaged in the same confrontation with the Omride dynasty. We see in 2 K. 6:32 how familiar the Naboth incident was, recalled by means of the verb *rṣḥ*.

Hos. 6:9 seems to speak of priests lying in wait for pilgrims and asylum seekers on the road to Shechem in order somehow to bring about their deaths, possibly without laying their own hands on their victims. Taken altogether, these passages show that in the northern kingdom *rṣḥ* denotes prominent instances of heinous acts of violence in which the victims were killed, directly or indirectly.

The two texts in the Psalms, 62:4(3) and 94:6, although hard to date, fit with this description of *rṣḥ*. Enemies destroy the righteous victim indirectly through falsehood and dissimulation (62:4[3]). The powerful among the people kill those whose social position is weak, probably by perversion of justice and by exploitation (94:6). These texts confirm the essence of *rṣḥ:* causing someone's death, while leaving open the manner in which the act is carried out.

2. *Apodictic Laws and Prophetic Invective.* The starting point for the development of this group of texts is the authentic text Hos. 6:9, where the prophet charges a group of priests on the way to Shechem with (repeated) murder. Hosea's disciples combined this charge with four others in Hos. 4:2.[15] From this quintet Jeremiah borrowed the triad "stealing — murder — adultery" in his temple sermon (Jer. 7:9). The nucleus of

15. J. Jeremias, *Hosea. ATD* XXIV/1 (1983), 59-60.

the Decalogue, which is dependent on Jeremiah, turns the accusations originating in the northern kingdom into law.[16] In the commandment of the Decalogue that prohibits killing, *rṣḥ* has the same meaning as in the northern kingdom material: the commandment forbids all actions and machinations not regulated by law that lead to the violent death of a fellow Israelite. Isa. 1:21ff. (where *rṣḥ* appears in a gloss) and Job 24:14-15 attest to the endurance of the prophetic-decalogic triad into the postexilic period.

3. *Asylum.* Our starting point is Ex. 21:12ff., which designates the sanctuary as a place of asylum in the premonarchic period (referring to any of the various sanctuaries where Yahweh causes his name to be remembered [Ex. 20:24]). The Court History of David also speaks of the tabernacle in Jerusalem as a place of asylum (1 K. 1:50-53; 2:28-34). With asylum in Yahweh's sanctuary is born the legal distinction between murder and manslaughter. Nothing is said, however, about who makes the finding or how the culprit, the avenger of blood, and the asylum officials interact.

The sanctuary asylum of the premonarchic period is replaced in Dt. 19 by a regular procedure; in the textual nucleus 19:2-7,11ff. (example and counterexample), the codifier of Deuteronomy modifies the earlier legislation of the Covenant Code in Ex. 21:12ff., borrowing from its clauses and terminology while introducing four striking changes.

First, in the asylum legislation of the Covenant Code, unpremeditated murder is an act of God (21:13), who causes the victim's death by the killer's hand. It is therefore logical that God should grant the protection of his sanctuary to a person to whose act he had been accessory.[17] For the Deuteronomist, human beings such as Moses and Israel take on regulation of the case, which is no longer explained as an instance of divine providence but by the example of an accident while at work (Dt. 19:5).

Second, the sanctuaries are replaced by cities of refuge, chosen on the basis of geometric geography and located in the middle of their territories. The Dtn conception is realized in Josh. 20:7. Jerusalem, an earlier place of asylum, drops out.

Third, the entire procedure becomes subject to legal regulation. The archaic institution of blood vengeance regulated the balance of power between families and tribes; in an age without an organized penal system under central control, it was an effective way of protecting life. From the institution of blood vengeance (cf. 2 S. 3:27; 14:11) is borrowed the figure of the avenger of blood, whose function as executioner is incorporated into the procedure and regulated. Someone who commits manslaughter receives protection from the avenger of blood: between the act and its revenge, flight to a city of refuge wins time for second thoughts and social pressure.[18] A murderer must not enjoy the privilege of asylum. Sitting in judgment in the gate, the elders of the city in whose territory the act took place and from which the killer has fled examine the case as to motive and circumstances. If their verdict is "murder," the alleged killer is taken from

16. Hossfeld, 276ff., 281ff.
17. F. Horst, *EvT* 16 (1956) 60 = *Gottes Recht. ThB* 12 (1961), 273.
18. N. Luhmann, *Rechtssoziologie* I (Hamburg, 1972), 158.

the city of refuge and handed over to the avenger of blood to be executed. Here we see the rational spirit of judgment in the gate, which is also incorporated into the reformed asylum legislation of Deuteronomy.

Fourth, the finding of "manslaughter" is revised. A new legal term is invented: the qal active participle of *rṣḥ*. The various attempts of the Covenant Code to distinguish between "murder" and "manslaughter" are systematized and focused on this new term, which is explained both abstractly (Dt. 19:4) and by an example (19:5). The criteria are motive and circumstances (19:4-5,11). It is possible to suggest reasons for the choice of *rṣḥ* as a technical term. The particular ability of the finding of *rṣḥ* to encompass the act of killing in its entirety was probably decisive. The verb takes motive into account, is open with respect to the different ways that killing might take place, and establishes the fatal outcome.

The difference between the prohibition of killing in the Decalogue (intentional) and the technical term in the asylum legislation (unintentional) is striking, especially because the disposition of the laws in Deuteronomy places asylum legislation at the head of the section (Dt. 19:1–21:23) relating to the Decalogue's prohibition of killing, developing the theme of killing vs. keeping alive.[19] Probably Dt. 19 differs from the Decalogue in its use of *rṣḥ* because the Decalogue, with its importance as the foundation and epitome of Mosaic legislation, had not yet exercised normative influence on the asylum legislation of Deuteronomy — further evidence that its influence on Deuteronomy came later, in any case after the "Josianic Proto-Deuteronomy,"[20] which may well have included the Dtn nucleus of 19:2-7,11-12. By exegetical consensus, Dt. 19 represents the earliest recension of the law regulating cities of refuge.[21]

The asylum regulations of Josh. 20:1-9 constitute in their final form a postexilic law of asylum. The internal procedural contradictions (e.g., v. 6), as well as the fusion of Dtn conceptions and language with Priestly language and notions, point to a complex stratification within the section. This complexity is not surprising, since Josh. 20:1-9 brings together in a single place the procedural regulations associated with the scattered asylum laws of the Pentateuch. Furthermore, v. 8 is dependent on the Transjordanian cities of refuge in Josh. 21:27,32,38. Possibly v. 7 represents the nucleus around which the various regulations clustered. The use of *rṣḥ* is totally in accord with the Dtn asylum legislation of Dt. 19: as the qal act. ptcp. *rōṣēaḥ, rṣḥ* remains a technical term for a person who commits manslaughter unintentionally.

The asylum arrangements of Dt. 4:41-43 are somewhat in competition with Josh. 20:8: there the Israelites (at Joshua's command) establish the three Transjordanian cities, whereas in Dt. 4:41-43 it is Moses who sets these cities apart. Their location (two in the north and one in the south) does not fit with the Dtn geometry of Dt. 19.[22]

---

19. G. Braulik, *Deuteronomium. NEB* XV (1986), 13; *idem, Bibl* 69 (1988) 80-91.
20. N. Lohfink, *JBTh* 4 (1989) 77.
21. Most recently D. Knapp, *Deuteronomium 4. GTA* 35 (1987), 117-20; H. Schulz, *Leviten im vorstaatlichen Israel und im Mittleren Osten* (Munich, 1987), 54-59; G. Braulik, *RB* 96 (1989) 281.
22. S. Mittmann, *Deuteronomium 1:1–6:3. BZAW* 139 (1975), 131 n. 6.

As we have seen,[23] the technical term used in the law governing cities of refuge loses its unchallenged status: the participle of *rṣḥ* is expanded tautologically by a finite verbal form of the root and must be delimited by adverbial qualifiers taken from Dt. 19:4. This development in 4:41ff. was probably influenced by the semantically contrary prohibition of killing in the Decalogue.

Nu. 35:9-34, dating from the postexilic period, contains the latest asylum legislation. Earlier analyses already noted the idiosyncratic use of *rṣḥ* in this legislation.[24] Vv. 9-12 (a self-contained section) and vv. 25-29 use the participle of *rṣḥ* as a technical term for unintentional manslaughter; v. 27 uses a finite verbal form of *rṣḥ* for the legally permissible slaying of a slayer by the avenger of blood — de facto a killing on impulse, not incurring bloodguilt. Vv. 13ff. avoid the use of *rṣḥ*. Vv. 16-24, by contrast, use the participle in the diametrically opposite sense of intentional killing or murder, as do vv. 30-34. In v. 30, as in v. 27, a finite verb form is introduced to denote the legally permissible slaying of a murderer. Vv. 16-24 constitute a separate section, set apart from the preceding verses by the use in v. 16 of a personal pronoun whose antecedent (the neighbor) is lacking and must be supplied. V. 24 marks a conclusion. The section vv. 25-29 has a solemn conclusion in v. 29, making vv. 30-34 appear to be a secondary addition. These observations suggest the following development: basic text in vv. 9-12,(13-15),25-29; secondary revision in vv. 16-24,30-34.

The basic text represents the Priestly recension of the Dtn law of asylum. As in Dt. 19, someone who commits manslaughter — defined as killing someone by mistake — is to be protected from the avenger of blood by cities of refuge. The Dtn court of elders is replaced by a trial before the congregation (Nu. 35:12). Probably this provision refers to the entire congregation of Israel, centered in Jerusalem.[25] This body examines the case of the slayer (v. 12), protects him from the avenger of blood, and sends him back, acquitted of the charge of murder, to the city of refuge where he found asylum (v. 25).

A new element is the definition of the period of asylum as lasting until the death of the current high priest. In the Priestly view, the asylum offered the slayer was a kind of protective custody, coercive and penal in nature, with restrictions on the movement of those granted asylum (vv. 26ff.). Even accidental homicide was an act so extraordinarily serious that it could be atoned for only by the death of the high priest, who was charged with making atonement by virtue of his office and who, as the presiding officer of the congregational court, was responsible for those granted asylum. The basic Priestly text (vv. 9-12,[13-15],25-29) takes the slayer into protective custody and legitimates the avenger of blood. The slayer who relinquishes protective custody or asylum destroys the system of atonement and must be eliminated as a "disruptive factor" within the community by the avenger of blood. If the slayer remains in protective custody until the death of the high priest, the process of atone-

23. See V above.
24. Stamm, 82-83; Jepsen, 384.
25. Nicolsky, 166; Phillips, 107; → VIII, 555-56.

ment is brought to its full and proper conclusion, and the slayer can return to normal life as a free citizen.

The revision of the basic text in vv. 16-24,30-34 adds considerable precision and interpretation to the procedure. These verses deliberately turn the technical term *rōṣēaḥ* on its head, understanding it as referring to a "murderer." The strict casuistic style of vv. 16-24 is interrupted between the finding and its legal consequences by a series of decisions declaring the culprits murderers. The exemplary verdicts are presented in three groups of statements. Vv. 16-19 demonstrate that the weapon used (an iron object, a stone, a wooden object) is evidence of murder. The avenger of blood carries out the death sentence. The second group, in vv. 20-21, examines the relationship between culprit and victim and proves malicious intent. The sentence is carried out by the avenger of blood. The third group, in vv. 22-23, brings together the criteria of the weapon used and the culprit's intent or motive and applies it to the case of (unintentional) manslaughter. V. 24 emphasizes that these cases are exemplary for the trial conducted by the congregation.

The addendum in vv. 30-34 then goes back to discussing the case of a murderer, again called *rōṣēaḥ*. V. 30 borrows the provisions regarding witnesses in Dt. 17:6 and 19:15; vv. 31-32 prohibit the payment of ransom for the life of the murderer, probably in order to underline the extraordinary gravity of the offense. Given the new language of this recension, the criminal referred in v. 32 must be described differently; the traditional technical term is no longer available, and the person who has committed manslaughter is referred to as one who has fled to a city of refuge. Vv. 33-34 provide the concluding theological justification for these procedural regulations.

The language of this recension runs counter not only to the tradition of asylum legislation and its forerunners, but also to the usage of its own basic text, using *rṣḥ* once again for the intentional killing of another Israelite. This procedure follows the usage of prohibition of killing in the Decalogue (cf. Dt. 4:41-43). The casuistic rulings of vv. 16-24 read like an inner-biblical paraphrase of the commandment against killing. The language of the Decalogue and that of asylum legislation coalesce in this late Priestly recension. This phenomenon may indicate that the Priestly tradition took account of the Decalogue only in late recensions and that Priestly redactors are responsible for including the Decalogue in the Pentateuch in Ex. 20. "Only in later usage, probably influenced by the Decalogue, does רצח denote premeditated murder. The transition can be observed in Nu. 35."[26]

VII. Summary. In comparison to its relative rarity, the material importance of *rṣḥ* is striking. The verb is associated with prominent transgressions in the northern kingdom, all particularly heinous, because the perpetrators often do not commit murder in person but use an accomplice. Characteristic of *rṣḥ* is its lack of specificity as to circumstances, which in any case result in the physical death of the victim. Physical death can

---

26. C. Levin, *Die Verheissung des Neuen Bundes in ihrem theologiegeschichtlichen Zusammenhang ausgelegt. FRLANT* 137 (1985), 94 n. 86.

also be brought about by social transgressions of the most varied kind, in the sense that "poor individuals, widows, orphans, and raped women . . . in all probability [are] killed more by the social consequences of certain acts than by direct assault."[27]

The triad found in the Decalogue and the prophets draws on the usage of these northern kingdom incidents. Asylum legislation goes its own way, following the lead of Dt. 19. It chooses the qal act. ptcp. *rōṣēaḥ* as a technical term for one who commits manslaughter. In late texts concerning asylum, both the Deuteronomists (Dt. 4) and the Priestly redactors (Nu. 35) desert this technical usage in favor of the language used by the Decalogue's prohibition against killing, thus furnishing important evidence that the Decalogue does not become influential in these two traditions until the exilic and postexilic periods.

The goal of the passages in question is to protect the life of every Israelite. In the postexilic congregation of citizens centered on the temple, resident and transient aliens could also be included (Nu. 35:15). The term does not envision killing in battle, the *ḥērem* or dedication to destruction, self-defense, or suicide. Murder is punished uniformly with death, and *rṣḥ* can denote the execution of the death sentence by the avenger of blood as required by law, as in Nu. 35:27,30.

VIII. LXX; Dead Sea Scrolls. The LXX uses *phoneúein* or *phoneús* to translate *rṣḥ* in every instance except Hos. 4:2, where we find *phónos.*

The root occurs only once in the Dead Sea Scrolls, in a catalog of virtues (CD 6:11-21). Alluding to Isa. 10:2, CD 6:17ff. exhorts the members of the community not to offer sacrifice "in vain" *(ḥinnām),* to observe the law, to keep themselves apart, not to rob the poor, not to exploit widows, not to murder orphans *(ytwmym),* to distinguish between clean and unclean, to keep the sabbath, and to observe the festival calendar. Positively, the catalog requires the offering of the holy gifts according to their exact interpretation, love of one's brother, and support for the needy *('ny),* the poor *('bywn),* and the stranger *(gr).*

Finally, 11QT 66:7 incorporates the regulations of Dt. 22:25ff.

Hossfeld

27. Crüsemann, 68.

רָצַץ rāṣaṣ; רעע r‘‘

I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences. II. Usage: 1. Qal; 2. Other Forms. III. r‘‘. IV. 1. LXX; 2. Dead Sea Scrolls.

I. 1. *Etymology.* Etymologically, Heb. *rṣṣ*, "crush," is related to Arab. *raḏḏa* and Aram. *r‘‘*, both of which have the same meaning. The aramaizing form *r‘‘* also occurs in Hebrew;[1] in addition, the hybrid form (?) *r‘ṣ* occurs twice.

2. *Occurrences.* Only the verb appears in the OT; it occurs 10 times in the qal (including 3 occurrences of the ptcp. *rāṣûṣ*), 4 times in the niphal, once in the hiphil, 3 times in the piel, and once each in the polel and hithpolel. The verb *r‘‘* II occurs 6 times in the qal and twice in the hithpael.

II. Usage. 1. *Qal.* The verb *‘āšaq*, "oppress, wrong," appears 5 times in parallel with *rṣṣ*, which then means approximately "maltreat." According to Dt. 28:33, if the people are disobedient, they will be oppressed (NRSV "abused") and maltreated (NRSV "crushed") by their enemies. When Samuel takes his leave, he asks the people whether he has defrauded *(‘šq)* or oppressed *(rṣṣ)* anyone; the people's denial uses the same verbs (1 S. 12:3-4). In other words, he has maintained social justice. According to Amos, this is precisely what the rich women of Samaria do not do: they oppress *(‘šq)* the weak *(dallîm)* and crush *(rṣṣ)* the needy *(’eḇyônîm)* (Am. 4:1). According to Hos. 5:11, Ephraim is oppressed *(‘šq)* by the other tribes and its rights trampled on *(rṣṣ)*. In Isa. 58:6 *rṣṣ* has the same attenuated meaning, here without *‘šq:* proper fasting consists in freeing the oppressed (EÜ "enslaved").

The verb has its concrete sense in 2 K. 23:12: Josiah broke in pieces the altars that Manasseh had built in the temple court. This meaning is also present in the expression *qāneh rāṣûṣ*, "a broken reed," symbolizing something weak and useless. Thus the Assyrian commander Rabshakeh says sarcastically that as an ally Egypt is like a broken reed, which pierces the hand of anyone who leans on it (2 K. 18:21). The first Servant Song in Deutero-Isaiah says that the servant will not break *(šbr)* a bruised reed or quench a dimly burning wick (Isa. 42:3) — in other words, he cares for the weak. But he himself will not grow faint (*kāhâ*, punning on *kēheh*, "dimly burning") or be crushed (*yārûṣ*, probably to be read as *yērōṣ*, the niphal of *rṣṣ* — another pun).

2. *Other Forms.* Another niphal form occurs in Ezk. 29:7, which also has to do with Egypt as a worthless ally: it is a reed that breaks when someone leans on it. There are two additional instances in Eccl. 12:6, where a golden bowl that breaks (*tāruṣ*, to be read as *tērōṣ*), a broken *(šbr)* pitcher, and a broken *(nārōṣ)* wheel symbolize the debility of old age.

---

1. See III below.

A hiphil form occurs in Jgs. 9:53: a woman crushes the skull of Abimelech with a millstone.

Only once does the piel have a concrete meaning, namely in Ps. 74:14, which says God crushed the heads of Leviathan. In the two other occurrences of the piel, the verb is used figuratively: Asa inflicts cruelties on the people (2 Ch. 16:10); the wicked crush and abandon the poor (Job 20:19; Zophar's second speech).

A polel form occurs in Jgs. 10:8, along with the hybrid form *r'ṣ:* the Ammonites tormented *(r'ṣ)* and oppressed *(rôṣᵉṣ)* the Israelites — a piece of typically Dtr historiography.

The hithpolel occurs only in Gen. 25:22: the twins Esau and Jacob struggle together in their mother's womb.

III. *r*''. Of the 8 occurrences of *r*'', "break," most are uncertain or ambiguous. One clear occurrence is in Isa. 24:19, which describes the fate of the earth in the great catastrophe, using three constructions with an infinitive absolute (qal!) and a hithpael imperfect: the earth is utterly broken *(r'')*, torn asunder *(prr)*, and violently shaken *(mwṭ)*. Also reasonably certain is Prov. 18:24: "There are [read: *yēš*] friends who strike each other down." Clearly there is a play on *rēa'/rē'eh*. But the verb can also be derived from *rā'â* II, "become friends," or *rw'*, "shout with joy, chatter."[2] But the antithesis in the second hemistich speaks of true friendship, supporting the meaning "strike."

Mic. 5:5(Eng. 6) promises that, when the king of salvation comes, the Israelites will shatter *(wᵉrā'û)* the Assyrians with the sword. Wolff, however, derives the verb form from *rā'â*, "pasture," which finds support in the LXX of Ps. 2:9.[3] The MT promises the king on Zion that he will break the enemy with a rod of iron; but instead of *tᵉrō'ēm* the LXX reads *tir'ēm*, "you will pasture them," i.e., rule over them. The second hemistich, however, "you will dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel," supports the MT reading. This passage may allude to the practice of writing the names of enemies on a pot and then smashing it. There are known parallels in the Egyptian execration texts.

Job 34:24 is reasonably certain. Elihu says: "He [God] shatters the mighty without investigation and sets others in their place" — for God knows their evil deeds. This interpretation is supported by *dk'* in v. 25.

Jer. 15:12 is unintelligible. It can be translated "Can one break iron, iron from the north, and bronze?" or "Can iron, iron from the north . . . ?" Neither yields coherent sense. Since vv. 13-14 are identical with 17:3-4, Rudolph considers 15:12 a corruption of 17:1.[4] Holladay connects 15:12 with the preceding text and sees in the verse an allusion to Hananiah (ch. 28).[5] He also sees a connection with Ps. 2:9, since *yᵉliḏtinî* in Jer. 15:10 recalls *yᵉliḏtîḵā* in Ps. 2:7.

Prov. 25:19 speaks of a crumbling *(rō'â)* tooth and a lame foot as images of the faithless, on whom one cannot rely in time of trouble. Another possible reading is *rā'â*, "bad" (cf. NRSV).

2. G. R. Driver, *Bibl* 32 (1951) 173-97.
3. H. W. Wolff, *Micah* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1990), 132.
4. W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* XII (³1968), 104.
5. W. L. Holladay, *Jeremiah 1. Herm* (1986), 447, 454-56.

Biblical Aram. *r*'' occurs in Dnl. 2:40: just as iron smashes (*r*'' pael) everything, so the fourth kingdom (the Greek) will crush (*dqq* haphel) and shatter (*r*'' peal) everything.

IV. 1. *LXX.* The LXX exhibits a rich spectrum in translating the verb. Translations occurring more than once are *thlán* and *synthlán* (for qal, niphal, piel, polel, and hiphil), *thraúein, katapateín,* and *syntríbein.* The hithpael is translated with *skirtán.*

2. *Dead Sea Scrolls.* In the Dead Sea Scrolls *rṣṣ* occurs only in CD 13:10: among the duties of the inspector *(m^ebaqqēr)* is seeing to it that there is no *'āšûq* and no *rāṣûṣ* in the community (possibly an allusion to Hos. 5:11?).

Ringgren

רָקַד *rāqaḏ*

I. 1. Etymology and Meaning; 2. Baal Marqod. II. Occurrences and Usage. III. Ancient Versions.

I. 1. *Etymology and Meaning.* The verb *rqd* occurs in many Semitic languages: Ugaritic *(mrqdm),*[1] Akkadian (*raqādu*[*m*]),[2] Arabic (*raqaṣa*[3] [but cf. also *irqadda,* "hurry," and *raqadān,* "leap (of lambs)"]), Syriac *(r^eqaḏ),*[4] Samaritan, Mandaic,[5] and other Aramaic languages.[6]

Almost without exception, the meaning of the verb in these languages is "leap, dance, move to and fro." In Syriac the verb *rqd* probably means "dance, leap" in the pael, but "mourn" in the aphel (in the Syriac Bible the aphel usually translates Heb. *spd*), a polarity that may suggest the two faces of religious dance.[7] Now and then *rqd* appears in anthroponyms and toponyms, for example, in Ugaritic.[8]

---

rāqaḏ. H. Dahan, "Reflexivity," *Leš* 44 (1980) 219-23; M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography X," *Bibl* 53 (1972) 386-403, esp. 396; M. I. Gruber, "Ten Dance-Derived Expressions in the Hebrew Bible," *Bibl* 62 (1981) 328-46; T. Klauser *et al.,* "Baal. A. Nichtchristlich," *RAC,* I, 1063-1103, esp. 1077-78; W. Röllig, "Baal-*Marqōd,*" *WbMyth,* I, 272; R. Zehnpfund, "Tanz bei den Hebräern," *RE,* XIX, 378-80.

1. *KTU,* 1.19, IV, 27; 1.108, 4-5; *UT,* no. 2351; *WUS,* no. 2540; cf. M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *UF* 12 (1980) 174, 176: "dancers"; but *CML*², 153: "castanets."

2. *AHw* II, 957.

3. Wehr, 354.

4. *LexSyr,* 743-44.

5. *MdD* 437.

6. *ChW,* II, 435-36; F. Schulthess, *Lexicon Syropalaestinum* (Berlin, 1903), 197.

7. W. R. Smith, *Religion of the Semites* (repr. New York, 1956), 432; F. F. Hvidberg, *Weeping and Laughter in the OT* (Leiden, 1962), 108.

8. *UT,* no. 2351; *PNU,* 180.

2. *Baal Marqod.* In modern Deir el-Qal'a near Beirut, there was a shrine to Baal Marqod, the "Lord of the Dance," whose cult was widespread in the ancient world, as Greek and Latin votive stones show (Βαλμαρκώθ, *Balmarcod*). He was identified primarily with Jupiter (of Heliopolis)[9] but also with a local form of Hadad.[10] He was probably considered a god of healing,[11] and his cult involved sacred dance.[12] In this connection 1 K. 18:26 is often cited: it describes the prophets of Baal as performing a hopping or leaping dance about the altar they had built on Mt. Carmel, possibly in order to produce a state of ecstasy.[13] Otherwise we know little more about Baal Marqod and his nature.

II. Occurrences and Usage. Of the 9 occurrences of the verb *rqd* in the OT, 3 are in the qal (Ps. 114:4,6; Eccl. 3:4), 5 in the piel (Isa. 13:21; Joel 2:5; Nah. 3:2; Job 21:11; 1 Ch. 15:29), and 1 in the hiphil (Ps. 29:6). In general the meaning "hop" or "dance" is appropriate in these passages. Other verbs in the OT that denote dancing or its various manifestations include → חול *ḥûl; krkr* (pilpel of *krr,* 2 S. 6:14,16); and *śḥq* (1 S. 18:7; 2 S. 6:5,21; 1 Ch. 13:8; 15:29); on occasion, *rqd* appears in their lexical field.[14] The word *ḥg* is also sometimes associated with dancing.[15]

For the most part the OT uses *rqd* in secular contexts, often figuratively. Ps. 114:4 and 6 describe the tumult of the natural world when Israel was delivered from Egypt, which was able to set mountains like Sinai in motion: the mountains skipped like rams and the hills like lambs. Here the word, which refers to a theophanic earthquake, may be understood as a parallel to *ḥrd* (Ex. 19:18), *zll* (Jgs. 5:5), or *r'š* (Ps. 68:9[Eng. 8]; Nah. 1:5).[16] In Ps. 29:6 God makes Lebanon skip like a calf. Here we find the causative form of *rqd* with an enclitic *mem.* Many early exegetes, including Bickell, Wellhausen, and Gunkel, rightly objected to interpreting this *mem* as a third person plural pronominal suffix, since it is inappropriate to think of the cedars of Lebanon, mentioned in the previous verse, as the object of the causative verb. Possibly we are dealing here with an enclitic element emphasizing the word to which it is attached; the existence of such an element in Ugaritic (**-ma* or **-mi*) has been demonstrated.[17]

Living beings such as children (Job 21:11) and goats (Isa. 13:21) also leap and dance (*rqd* piel). In a description of the day of the Lord (Joel 2:1-11), which probably reflects a description of a plague of locusts,[18] as well as in a threat against the city of Nineveh (Nah. 3:1-7), the noise and din of the advancing army are compared to the clatter of

---

9. Klauser; Röllig; H. Gese, in Gese, M. Höfner, and K. Rudolph, *Die Religionen Altsyriens, Altarabiens und die Mandäer. RM* 10/2 (1970), 202; W. Fauth, *KlPauly,* I, 792.

10. R. Dussaud, *PW,* III, A/1.

11. Klauser.

12. F. Cumont, *PW,* II/2, 2835.

13. → XII, 5-7.

14. Gruber.

15. → IV, 202; Zehnpfund.

16. H. Gunkel, *Psalmen. HKAT* II/2 ([4]1926), 493-94.

17. Meyer, §87,6; *HAL,* III, 1288; M. Dahood, *Psalms I. AB* XVI (1965), 178; *idem, Psalms III. AB* XVII A (1968), 408-9.

18. C. van Leeuwen, *NedTT* 42 (1988) 89-98.

chariots: like rumbling chariots the locusts leap over the tops of the mountains (Joel 2:5), and bounding chariots are heard in the great city of Nineveh (Nah. 3:2).[19]

In Eccl. 3:2-8 the chiastic stichs present a series of contrasting positives and negatives.[20] V. 4 sets mourning *(s^epôḏ)*[21] over against the joy expressed by *r^eqôḏ*. Here we may suspect a shift to a more cultic or religious use of the verb, although this semantic aspect does not emerge directly from the use of the verb in the OT.[22]

But dancing and gamboling can easily take on a religious character, as we see in the account of David's bringing the ark into Jerusalem (2 S. 6 par. 1 Ch. 15). In 1 Ch. 15:29 we read that Michal looked out the window and saw David leaping and dancing *(m^eraqqēḏ ûm^eśaḥēq)* before the ark. In 2 S. 6:16 the words *m^epazzēz ûm^ekarkēr* are used instead. Only here in the OT is the verb *pzz* II attested in the piel with the meaning "dance" (cf. Gen. 49:24).[23] The pilpel of the verb *krr* II likewise occurs only in 2 S. 6:14,16 with the meaning "leap."[24] It is not entirely out of the question that the Chronicler, as is often true when revising earlier sources, used more familiar words to replace not only words that might be misunderstood but also words that he found cultically or religiously offensive. The setting of the narrative is nevertheless cultic in nature. The LXX translation of *'aḥaḏ hārēqîm* as *heís tṓn orchouménōn* in 2 S. 6:20 (cf. also OL and Vg.) makes it likely that the translator read *hārēqîm* rather than *hārōq^eḏîm*.[25] In v. 21 the LXX likewise inserts *kaí orchḗsomai* after *w^eśiḥaqtî*.

III. Ancient Versions. The translation of *rqd* in the LXX varies: *skirtán* (Ps. 113[114]:4,6), *orcheísthai* (Eccl. 3:4; Isa. 13:21; 1 Ch. 15:29), *exállesthai* (Joel 2:5), *anabrássein* (Nah. 3:2), *leptýnein* (Ps. 28[29]:6), *prospaízein* (Job 21:11). It is worth noting that Zec. 12:10 uses a form of *katorcheísthai* for *dqr* (cf. John 19:37, *exekéntēsan*, from *ekkenteín*). This observation probably led to the textually unjustified conjecture that *dqr* should be replaced by *rqd* in Zec. 12:10.[26]

In addition to *saltare* (Eccl. 3:4; Isa. 13:21; 1 Ch. 15:29), the Vg. uses various other words for *rqd*, such as *subsilire* (Ps. 114:4,6), *exsilire* (Joel 2:5), *exsultare* (Job 21:11), and even a form of *dispergere* in Ps. 29:6.

The verb has not yet been found in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Mulder

---

19. K. J. Cathcart, *JNSL* 7 (1979) 10.
20. J. A. Loader, *ZAW* 81 (1969) 240-42.
21. → ספד *sāpaḏ*.
22. Zehnpfund, 378-79.
23. *HP*, 153.
24. *HAL*, II, 500; G. W. Ahlström, *VT* 28 (1978) 100-102; but cf. Y. Avishur, *VT* 26 (1976) 257-61.
25. S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and Topography of the Books of Samuel* (Oxford, ²1913), 272.
26. H. Schlier, "ἐκκεντέω," *TDNT*, II, 446-47.

רָקִיעַ rāqîaʿ; רָקַע rāqaʿ

I. 1. Root and Lexical Field; 2. Verbal Forms. II. 1. P; 2. Ezekiel; 3. Poetry. III. Egyp. *bἰ3*. IV. Later Literature.

I. 1. *Root and Lexical Field.* Outside the OT, the noun *rāqîaʿ* has been found only in the later Semitic dialects such as Babylonian Targumic Aramaic,[1] Syriac,[2] Mandaic,[3] and Aramaic.[4] It may be taken as a *qāṭîl* form derived from the root *rqʿ*, usually cited with the meaning "spread out, stamp," or the like; this etymology would suggest that the noun means something like "extended surface."[5] Morphologically, however, the form *rāqîaʿ* parallels the noun *rāqîq*, derived from the root *rqq* I, the mother lode of a lexeme family in which the root *rqʿ* and its derivatives constitute a dissimilated variant group. All instantiations of the roots *rqq* I and *rqʿ* share the semic content "be/make thin." Phonetically and semasiologically, they resemble many other classes of word formation in East Semitic.

Related to Akk. *raqāqu*, "be(come) thin, narrow,"[6] are the adjectival forms *raqqu* I, "thin, narrow, fine,"[7] and *raqqaqu/ruqququ*, "very thin,"[8] as well as the nominal forms *raqqatu* I, "a thin garment," Late Babylonian "a thin decorative plate,"[9] and *ruqqu* II,

---

rāqîaʿ. H. Altenmüller, "Heh," *LexÄg*, II, 1082-84; J. Assmann, "Primat und Transzendenz," in W. Westendorf, ed., *Aspekte der spätägyptischen Religion. Göttinger Orientforschungen*, IV/9 (1979), 7-42; A. Ge'alya, "רָקִיעַ — רְקִיעַ שָׁמַיִם," *Leš* 36 (1971/72) 34-50; M. Görg, "Firmament," *NBL*, I, 674-75; *idem*, "Das Menschenbild der Priesterschrift," *BiKi* 42 (1987) 21-29; *idem*, "Ptolemäische Theologie in der Septuaginta," in H. Maehler and V. M. Strocka, eds., *Das ptolemäische Ägypten. Akten des internationalen Symposions 27.-29. September 1976 in Berlin* (Mainz, 1978), 177-85 = *Kairos* 20 (1978) 208-17; E. Graefe, "Untersuchungen zur Wortfamilie *bj3*" (diss., Köln, 1971); E. Hornung, "Himmelsvorstellungen," *LexÄg*, II, 1215-18; B. Jongeling, "Le Particule רַק," *OTS* 18 (1973) 97-107; O. Keel, *Jahwe-Visionen und Siegelkunst. SBS* 84/85 (1977); D. Kellermann, "Ein Beitrag zur Bedeutung des Wortes *MRQ*'," *ZDPV* 86 (1970) 24-37; D. Kurth, *Den Himmel stützen. Rites Égyptiens*, 2 (Brussels, 1975); T. M. Ludwig, "The Traditions of the Establishing of the Earth in Deutero-Isaiah," *JBL* 93 (1973) 345-57, esp. 347-49; V. Notter, *Biblischer Schöpfungsbericht und ägyptische Schöpfungsmythen. SBS* 68 (1974); G. Rinaldi, *"Reqîaʿ ʿōz," BiOr* 25 (1983) 104; W. H. Schmidt, *Die Schöpfungsgeschichte der Priesterschrift. WMANT* 17 (³1973); O. H. Steck, *Der Schöpfungsbericht der Priesterschrift. FRLANT* 115 (²1981); H. Torczyner, "The Firmament and the Clouds," *ST* 1 (1948) 188-96; E. Zenger, *Gottes Bogen in den Wolken. SBS* 112 (²1987).

1. *ChW*, 436.
2. *LexSyr*, 744.
3. *MdD*, 437.
4. Beyer, 697.
5. Most recently *HAL*, III, 1290.
6. *AHw*, II, 957.
7. *AHw*, II, 958.
8. *AHw*, II, 957, 995.
9. *AHw*, II, 958.

"a thin, narrow area."[10] Probably Akk. *ruqqu* I, "(metal) kettle, bowl,"[11] also belongs to this group. Ugaritic appears to have a noun *rq,* which may mean "plate."[12] A noun phrase *mrqʿ ḥrṣ,* "plate of gold," is still attested in Phoenician.[13] According to Kellermann, this is the only Phoenician evidence for *mrqʿ* and the phrase should be translated "golden battle-ax."[14] The preformative, however, can also refer to the "place" that is hammered, so that it is still possible to think of a metal plate (or a metal bowl with thin walls).

In Christian Palestinian Aramaic the noun *mrqʿ* can serve as the translation of *epíblēma* (Luke 5:36); in Post-Biblical Hebrew, *mrqwʿ* can be used to mean "tatter, piece of a garment."[15] While Kellermann suggests the semantic development "spread out, stamp, pound together" > "patch, mend," Baumgartner, citing Arab. *raqaʿa,* "patch," considers the reverse development also possible.[16] We are freed from the need to decide between these alternatives if we take the primary meaning of the root *rqʿ* to be "make thin," as a particular mode of stabilization. This understanding also fits the noun *mrqwʿ,* "flatbread," found in Post-Biblical Hebrew. Definition of the meaning as "spread out" is not required either by the phrase *brqwʿ ybšh,* "at the curve of the dry land" (1QH 3:31), or by Late Aram. *rᵉqaʿ,* "famous,"[17] even though semantic shifts in later dialects must be taken into account.

The assumption of a biliteral root morpheme *rq* with the appropriate semic definition is possible,[18] albeit not certain, since the homonymous root *rqq* II, "spit," with its derivatives must remain outside the group.

The root *rqq* does not occur as a verb in the OT, appearing only in the nouns *rāqîq,* "thin cake" (Ex. 29:2,23; Lev. 2:4; 7:12; 8:26; Nu. 6:15,19; 1 Ch. 23:29), and *raqqâ,* "temple (of head)" (Jgs. 4:21,22; 5:26;[19] Cant. 4:3; 6:7), as well as the form *raq(q),* used as an adjective and particle.[20] The root *rqʿ,* however, while also having nominal derivatives such as the hapax legomenon *riqquaʿ,* "(metal) sheet" (Nu. 17:3[Eng. 16:38]), and our noun *rāqîaʿ,* is represented primarily by verbal syntagms.

2. *Verbal Forms.* The qal of *rqʿ* is used in three different ways. It can appear with a direct object, meaning "stamp down (enemies)" (2 S. 22:43), or with an adverbial ex-

---

10. *AHw,* II, 995.
11. *Ibid.*
12. *KTU,* 1.4, VI, 34; cf. *CML²,* 158; J. Gray, *Legacy of Canaan. SVT* 5 (²1965), 298; G. del Olmo Lete, *Mitos y Leyendas de Canaan* (Madrid, 1981), 625.
13. *KAI,* 38.1; R. S. Tomback, *A Comparative Semitic Lexicon of the Phoenician and Punic Languages. SBLDS* 32 (1978), 200.
14. Kellermann, 36-37.
15. For further details see Kellermann, 33-34.
16. *HAL,* III, 1292.
17. Contra *HAL,* III, 1291.
18. Jongeling.
19. M. Rozelaar, *Amsterdamse cahiers voor exegese en Bijbelse theologie* 7 (1986), 123-29: "throat, neck" (from *rqq* II).
20. Jongeling.

pression, meaning "stamp (with one's feet)" (Ezk. 6:11; 25:6), with reference to a metaphorical or symbolic action. The root can also appear in participial expressions predicated of God, where it can denote God's "establishment" of the heavens (Isa. 42:5; 44:24) as well as of the earth (Ps. 136:6).

The piel, with a strictly technical sense, is also used in three different ways. With a direct object, it means "hammer (metal) thin" (Ex. 39:3; Nu. 17:4[16:39]); with an adverbial expression, it means "overlay (an idol) with hammered metal" (Isa. 40:19). The corresponding pual means "beaten thin" (Jer. 10:9). Finally, there is a single instance of the hiphil, which again uses the image of casting a metal mirror to describe God's formation of the heavens (Job 37:18).

The late literary origin of all these occurrences is unmistakable. Furthermore, especially in the passages that use *rqʿ* in a cosmic context, a semantic orientation toward the noun *rāqîaʿ* is impossible to miss, although this association does not mean that we should speak of a denominative meaning of the verb in a secondary use of the stem.[21]

This overview shows that the semic content of *rqʿ* should be looked for not in the action's spatial extension but in its description. Here the aspects of technological compression and intensive stabilization are primary.

II. 1. *P.* The noun *rāqîaʿ* finds its first setting in the context of P's creation account. In Gen. 1:6 its materialization is articulated by the follow sequence: jussive of *hāyâ* — subject: *rāqîaʿ* (anarthrous) — locative phrase: *bᵉṯôḵ hammayim* — purpose clause: *hāyâ* with the hiphil participle of *bdl* and a dislocative expression. V. 7 describes the execution of the process, using the same vocabulary and reinforced by the corroboration formula. V. 8a ends the introduction of the *rāqîaʿ* with its naming ("sky") and a tally counting the second day.

The unity of this passage appears to suffer from a tension between the verbal command (v. 6) and its execution (v. 7), so that v. 6 could be understood as a P expansion of v. 7.[22] More likely, however, the proclamation and materialization of the *rāqîaʿ* here represent a primary fragment of tradition (prototext?), whereas the association of this event with the system of days and the creation of light (vv. 3-5), accomplished exclusively by God's word, appears to belong to a second recension (P^G). Thus the materialization of the *rāqîaʿ* corresponds to the spatial dimension, which — according to the earlier outline of the creation account — precedes the creation of time (light).

To all appearances, the initial version of P's cosmogony goes back to a schema based on Egyptian cosmogonies: the transformation sequence chaos — space — time identified by Assmann.[23] This schema starts with the existence of chaos represented by the pairs of primal deities and then introduces the materializations of space and time as conditions for the development and preservation of life, brought about by the intervention of the sun god.

---

21. Contra *GesB,* 774-75.

22. Schmidt, 101-3; C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1984), 115-17; contra Steck, 72-83.

23. Assmann, 30-31.

Despite the naming in v. 8, the remainder of P's creation account combines *rāqîaʿ* with *haššāmayim* in a single construct phrase denoting the place where the "lights" are located (vv. 14-15,17) and birds fly (v. 20). Since, however, *haššāmayim,* the *nomen rectum,* can be considered a commentary on *rāqîaʿ,* we need register merely a formal modification.

The creation of the "lights" corresponds to the next transformation in the cosmogonic schema: now the dimension of time comes into play as the complementary constitutive element for upholding the reality of creation.

In P (including its possible prototext), therefore, *rāqîaʿ* denotes a stable, solid entity situated above the earth, which protects the living world from an influx of the waters of chaos. The noun bears the connotation "compact, firm,"[24] so that translations such as "expanse"[25] miss the mark.

2. *Ezekiel.* We meet a second setting for the noun *rāqîaʿ* in texts depicting the heavenly visions of Ezekiel. According to the description in Ezk. 1:22 (nonspecific nominal clause, probably kept intentionally vague), there was a "form" *(dᵉmûṯ)* "over the heads of the living creatures," a *rāqîaʿ,* qualified in greater detail by a simile: "like the gleam [*ʿayin*] of terrifying ice."[26] "Under the *rāqîaʿ*" were stretched out the wings of the living creatures (v. 23). A sound could be heard "from the place above the *rāqîaʿ,*" "over their heads" (v. 25). In addition, "above the *rāqîaʿ*" over their heads there appeared a "throne form" like lapis lazuli (v. 26). The composite nature of the text appears above all in the position of v. 25 (interpreted as a gloss[27]), if we do not follow Zimmerli in treating vv. 23-25 as secondary.[28]

In addition, Ezk. 10:1 recounts that there appeared "above the *rāqîaʿ,*" "over the heads of the cherubim," "something like lapis lazuli, in form resembling a throne." The introduction of the cherubim (instead of the "living creatures" of Ezk. 1) is due to redactional interpretation,[29] which apparently has expanded a single cherub bearing the throne into a tetrad.[30]

The image of living creatures bearing a heavenly throne is represented copiously in ancient Near Eastern iconography; in particular, the "four creatures with their four wings, four faces, and bull's feet (?) . . . have their closest parallels in the sky-bearers found with some frequency in northern Mesopotamia and Syria from the fifteenth century B.C.E. on."[31] But we must also recall the images of sky-bearers in Egypt; their wide diffusion is well attested. Typical are the texts and scenes related to the idea of *twȝ pt* ("bearing the sky"); these are especially common on temple walls dating from the

24. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 122.
25. Zenger, 185ff.
26. Following Keel, 133, 254-55, despite LXX *krýstallos.*
27. Keel, 144.
28. Zimmerli, 130.
29. *Ibid.,* 250; Keel, 188.
30. Keel, 188, 190-91.
31. Keel, 271, with references.

Greco-Roman period, though of course they presuppose conceptions from the earlier history of Egyptian religion.[32] For the role of the theriomorphic wind gods as bearers of the sky, decorations of the temple of Kom Ombo in Upper Egypt are characteristic.[33] In addition, the Huh gods (Huh as the primal god of infinity) associated with the wind god Shu are of special interest, especially since they appear as early as the Middle Kingdom (in the Coffin Texts) as theriomorphic helpers of Shu.[34] Therefore we cannot rule out egyptogenic notions as an inspiration for Ezekiel's vision in its primary version.

The notion of *rāqîa'* as a "heavenly plate" or the like can also resemble the idea of the heavenly body *pt,* although the latter is subject to divergent conceptions in Egypt that cannot readily be reconciled.[35] However that may be, the form of the *pt* hieroglyph is relatively narrow, with ends pointed downward; illustrations exhibit a more or less marked elongation, so that there is a certain outward similarity.[36]

The earlier version of Ezekiel's vision is characterized by theriomorphic creatures bearing the *rāqîa',* which may have evolved under the influence of Egyptian conceptions; the later version, however, in which the bearers are anthropomorphic, with four wings, multiple faces, and the feet of bulls, is more likely the product of Mesopotamian and Syrian inspiration.[37]

The development of the idea of *rāqîa'* as a platform or pedestal supporting a throne is probably not based directly on the notion of Yahweh's enthronement in the Jerusalem temple. More likely it is a kind of alternative conception, which, as in Isaiah's vision (Isa. 6), transcends the ideas associated with enthronement and understands *rāqîa'* as a mysterious barrier and the foundation of God's heavenly throne. In any event it would be wrong to talk of a "mobilization" of the throne in the primary account of Ezekiel's vision,[38] even though the present form of the text describes a mobile throne with wheels. The idea of the mystery of Yahweh's exalted presence, which competes with the notion of Yahweh's "enthronement upon the cherubim," need not have originated outside Jerusalem. Like Isaiah's vision, it could reflect contrasting conceptions arising on the spot. Here Ezekiel may be profiting from insights that found acceptance among the priesthood.

3. *Poetry.* The twofold aspect of *rāqîa'* as the radiant firmament and the heavenly dwelling place of the enthroned God is reflected in the language of poetry, which can use *rāqîa'* in chiastic parallelism with *šāmayim* as the "subject performing an act of proclamation"[39] (Ps. 19:2[1]) as well as in direct parallelism with *qōḏeš,* "sanctuary," both lexemes equally representing the exalted dwelling place of God (Ps. 150:1). Even later,

32. Kurth, 77-88.
33. A. Gutbub in Keel, 328-53.
34. Kurth, 81-82.
35. Hornung, 1215-16.
36. See also J. Herrmann, *Ezechiel. KAT* XI (1924), 18; Keel, 251.
37. Keel, 235-43.
38. As noted correctly by Keel, 251-55.
39. I. Fischer, *BN* 21 (1983) 17.

Dnl. 12:3 uses the word to liken the brightness of the "wise" to the radiance of the "firmament," and Sir. 43:8 refers to the power of the moon to illuminate the "firmament." Both texts reflect stereotyped usage; the latter establishes a connection with the language of P.

III. Egyp. *bỉꜣ*. The notion of *rāqîaʿ* as a "heavenly plate" has no convincing analog in Mesopotamia and Syria. Representations of the sky-bearers from the Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid periods display no trace of a "firmament."[40] It is nevertheless dubious that "the vision of Ezekiel represents a combination of the sky-bearer concept with that of a throne on its pedestal."[41] Besides the ideas associated explicitly with representations of the "sky" *(pt),* Egyptian concepts also appear in texts and scenes associated with the term *bỉꜣ*. Its correspondence to *rāqîaʿ* has already been noted for the creation context;[42] but this correspondence can also be elaborated to include the other aspects, although it is not necessary to think of *rāqîaʿ* as a "loan translation" of Egyp. *bỉꜣ*.[43]

The word *bỉꜣ* means "bronze, metal"; with or without an explicit reference to *pt,* "sky," it can also mean "iron" or "iron ore (hematite)," lit. "meteorite," since iron was thought to have a heavenly origin.[44] But even greater significance attaches to the understanding of *bỉꜣ* as the "heavenly shell," i.e., "the shell of primal ice that emerged from the primal flood at the dawn of creation."[45] The mineralogical aspect of the word furthers the notion that this "shell" possessed extraordinary durability, having the nature of an "unchangeable and probably gleaming substance."[46] In addition, *bỉꜣ* is a qualitative feature of the "heavenly throne"[47] and a term denoting the "heavens" and the "heavenly stream" on which the sun god sojourns.[48] On the formal level the absolute use of *bỉꜣ* in the sense of "heavens" together with the combination *bỉꜣ n pt,* "metal from the heavens, iron,"[49] is noteworthy, since it corresponds to the double valence of *rāqîaʿ* in P. Finally, *bỉꜣ* is related etymologically and semantically to the common expression *bỉꜣyt,* which has the particular connotation of "valuables" and "marvels."[50]

The P conception of *rāqîaʿ* apparently adopts the notion of a solid "shell" above the earth to accord with the cosmogonic idea of an enormous "egg shell," conceived as a wall separating the inhabited world from the sphere containing the menacing waters of chaos. Like *bỉꜣ*, *rāqîaʿ* is the realm of the heavens and the heavenly bodies, albeit expressly an element of Yahweh's primal act of creation. In its original form, Ezekiel's notion of *rāqîaʿ* envisages a heavenly body of extraordinary durability, though empha-

---

40. Keel, 261.
41. *Ibid.*
42. Notter, 74-75.
43. *Ibid.*, 75.
44. Graefe, 26-31.
45. *Ibid.*, 66.
46. *Ibid.*, 18.
47. *Ibid.*, 20-25.
48. *Ibid.*, 40-46.
49. *Ibid.*, 30-31.
50. *Ibid.*, 91ff.

sizing its mysterious radiance to an extent that goes beyond the Egyptian conception. The poetic use of *rāqîa'*, too, fits with the semantics of *biȝ*, especially since *biȝ* can also refer to the heavenly realm.

The translations of the LXX *(sterédōma;* only in Dnl 12:3 *ouranós)* and Vg. *(firmamentum)* correspond most closely to the biblical and comparative evidence, granted that the earlier mythological connotation of the word comes into play when it is integrated into language describing the majesty of the biblical creator God.

IV. Later Literature. In the context of the reception of the notions of *rāqîa'* developed in P and Ezekiel, intertestamental literature adds to the aspects it inherited only the attempt — not entirely successful — to give sharper contours to the position of *rāqîa'* as an element of God's work of creation. According to Jub. 2:4, *rāqîa'* was created on the second day "in the midst of the waters," so that the waters were divided, half above and half below the "firmament." The "firmament" is localized "in the middle of the surface," while the domain beneath the "firmament" is defined more precisely as the "surface of the earth," so that the text probably envisions a superterrestrial location of *rāqîa'*. On the other hand, the comment on the third day of creation speaks of the removal of the waters "from the middle of the surface of the earth to a place beyond the firmament" (2:6), so that here *rāqîa'* could correspond only to the dry land. The parallels to the account of creation in Jubilees cited by Berger confirm the futility of trying to reconcile the different conceptions, especially because the Ethiopic version of 4 Ezra (6:41-42) says that a portion of the waters rose "into the firmament, beneath the midst of the surface of the whole earth," while the Syriac version of Jubilees speaks only of one half of the waters "on the surface of the whole earth."[51] The Ethiopic version of 4 Ezra (6:49ff.) then speaks again of removing the waters "from the surface of the earth to a place beyond the 'firmament,'" whereas the Syriac version of Jubilees locates the waters "at a place within the 'firmament.'" The attempt of Tisserant to give precedence to the Syriac version merely confirms the impression that one can no longer speak of an agreed reception of the OT *rāqîa'* conceptions in intertestamental literature.[52]

In the Dead Sea Scrolls we find a fanciful treatment of *rāqîa'*; in contrast to other intertestamental literature, these texts base their image more on an elaboration of Ezekiel's vision, though they reflect the doxological aspect of poetic usage. The *Hodayoth* fragments speak of *rāqîa'* as a "firmament above the wings of the wind" (19:3) or a "firmament of holiness" (20:3; cf. Ps. 150:1). In association with the "heavens," *rāqîa'* can appear in the singular (4Q503 frs. 1-6, 3:1) as well as the plural (4QpNah frs. 1-2, 2); the latter text describes storms and tempests as "firmaments of his heaven" and also of the earth. In a different vein 4Q504 frs. 1-2, 7:6 speaks of the "holy firmament" (cf. Ps. 150:1, but also 1QH 13:8-9; 4Q405 frs. 20-22, 9 [Song of the Eleventh Sabbath]) as the habitation of the angels, whose association with *rāqîa'* is em-

---

51. K. Berger, *JSHRZ* II/3, 325.
52. E. Tisserant, *RB* 30 (1921) 68-69; see also Berger, *JSHRZ* II/3, 325.

phasized particularly in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice. Here the "spiritual beings" are conceived as bearers and (in agreement with traditional notions) as figures offering praise and adoration (cf. the gesture of raised hands symbolizing both support of the heavens and praise of God) (4Q403 fr. 1, 1:41-43; cf. also 4Q405 fr. 6, 2-3). The firmament is constituted of "spiritual creatures" (4Q405 fr. 19, 3-4) and "cherubim" (4Q405 frs. 20-22, 8), but radiates its brilliance through the throne of God above it (4Q405 frs. 20-33, 9; cf. already Ex. 24:10; Ezk. 1:22). Those who support the "firmaments of purity" proclaim their praise and blessing of "the firmaments of his glory" (4Q405 fr. 23, 1:6-7). To the "firmaments" are ascribed a "wondrous" *(pl')* quality (e.g., 11QShirShabb frs. 5-6, 1, 4-5; j-d-g-p 3). Whether the dominant association of *rāqîa'* at Qumran with the realm of the supporting angels also suggests a separate relationship "to the expanse of the heavens" appears questionable.[53]

Görg

53. Cf. C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice. HSS* 27 (1985), 375-76, discussing 11QShirShabb fr. 2, 4.